

THE POLITICAL MOVEMENTS
AND
AWAKENING IN RAJASTHAN
(1857 to 1947)

THE
POLITICAL MOVEMENTS
AND
AWAKENING IN
RAJASTHAN
(1857 to 1947)

K. S. SAXENA
*Lecturer in Political Science,
Govt. College, Ajmer (Rajasthan)*

S. CHAND & CO. (Pvt.) LTD.
RAM NAGAR, NEW DELHI-55

S. CHAND & CO. (Pvt.) LTD.
H.O. : RAM NAGAR, NEW DELHI-55

Branches :

Fountain, Delhi-6	32, Ganesh Chandra Ave., Calcutta-13
Mai Hiran Gate, Jullundur	35, Mount Road, Madras-2
Aminabad Park, Lucknow	Sultan Bazar, Hyderabad
102, Prasad Chambers, Behind Roxy Cinema, Bombay-4	Khazanchi Road, Patna-4 1; Khajuri Bazar, Indore

A thesis approved for the Degree of Ph.D. of the University of Rajasthan

Dedicated

to

*Those who laid down
their life for Freedom*

FOREWORD

The democratic movements of our country, planned and executed to get rid of despotism, oligarchy and bureaucracy have a long and chequered history. These movements had an enormous appeal. Each of the British Indian provinces and erstwhile native states experienced special pride in organising these movements and in intensifying the struggle for freedom.

In Rajasthan too, national sentiment proved a most efficacious stimulant to achieving national independence. It passed through various stages. It started with the dissatisfaction of the nobles against their Liege-Lords. Its main object in the beginning was not political but social. Subsequently it became an agrarian revolt against the oppressive feudal landlords. It also became a protest of the peasants against the illegal and excessive exactions. Along with this there was an awakening among the Bhils and the Jats which led to an agitation against the oppressive laws of the states and illiberal policies of the rulers.

After the establishment of the Indian Congress and subsequent formation of the Praja Mandals, liberation movement gained momentum in Rajasthan. There arose a band of resourceful leaders who advocated the cause of national independence. Simultaneously, there appeared the radicals who were not content with satisfactions they received from the Princes. They demanded the total elimination of the British and their supporters. These efforts ultimately were crowned with success.

The present thesis which was prepared under my supervision and guidance presents a systematic narrative of the political awakening in Rajasthan from 1857-1947. The author has rightly selected its title 'Political Awakening', as in my opinion it correctly describes the essential nature of the movement. For its presentation Dr. Saxena has carefully utilized contemporary archi-

val records in English and Rajasthani including some source material belonging to the private agencies. It deals with a connected account of the forces and counter-forces working within and without Rajasthan. The text has been enlivened by the inclusion of some of the little known, but significant events associated with the life of the participants. The writer has skilfully integrated the national progress with the great events that determined the entire course of the history of Rajasthan for nearly a century.

I hope the work will be found useful both by the lay reader and the expert researcher, who wish to have in a simple, concise and comprehensive form a connected account of the history of political awakening in Rajasthan.

Jaipur
August 25, 1971.

DR. G. N. SHARMA
M.A., Ph.D., D. Litt.
Professor of History,
University of Rajasthan.

PREFACE

An attempt has been made in the following pages to trace the history of the political movements and the growth of political awakening in Rajasthan from 1857 to 1947. The history of Rajasthan is the history of sacrifice and valour. The heroic battles fought by the rulers of Mewar and Marwar against the Arabs, the Turks and the Mughals and later against the British served as a source of inspiration to the people of these princely States who subsequently rose against the autocratic rule of the Rajput Princes and demanded establishment of 'responsible government'. Freedom cannot be gifted; it has to be won. The States' subjects, therefore, had to fight relentlessly to achieve freedom both against the British and their own autocratic rulers. They had to struggle simultaneously on two fronts. But their sacrifices, valour and courage ultimately bore fruit when India became independent on 15th August, 1947.

The present dissertation is based mostly on the original material lying untapped so far in the National Archives of India and Rajasthan State Archives. To reinforce objectivity papers in private collections and more than forty national and local newspapers and periodicals have been examined and utilised in the preparation of this work.

I should express my gratitude to Dr. G. N. Sharma, Ph. D., D. Litt., Professor of History, University of Rajasthan, under whose able guidance the present work was undertaken and completed. In fact but for his guidance and keen interest the present work could not have been completed. I would also express my deep gratitude to my respected teacher, Professor A. B. Mathur for his kind encouragement and help.

I wish also to thank the Directors of the National Archives of India and the Rajasthan State Archives for providing me with

the necessary facilities for the study of original records in their custody. I am also indebted to the Manager, Saraswati Library, Fatehpur (Shekhawati), who also provided me with all the facilities for the study of the newspaper records in their custody.

Ajmer

K. S. SAXENA

August 25, 1971.

ABBREVIATIONS

E.I.Co.	: East India Company.
F.C.	: Foreign Consultation.
F. & P.	: Foreign and Political Department.
G.O.I.	: Government of India.
Home Pol.	: Home and Political Department.
Ibid.	: In the same place.
NAI.	: National Archives of India, New Delhi.
op. cit.	: Opus citatum (the work cited).
P.	Page.
PP.	: Pages.
P.C.	: Political Consultation.
R.S.A.	: Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.
S.C.	: Secret Consultation.
W.D.	: Wellesley's Despatches.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Pages
Foreword	vii-viii
Preface	ix-x
Abbreviations	xi
I	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—SEEDS OF UNREST 1-17
Survey of Medieval Warfare in Rajasthan—Moral Degredation of the Princes of Rajasthan—British attitude towards the Rajputana States (1803-1805)—The Policy of British Protection—Treaty with Jaipur (1803)—Treaty with Jodhpur (1803)—Treaty with Alwar (1803)—Treaty with Bharatpur (1805)—Observations on the policy of Lord Wellesley—Lord Cornwallis, Sir George Barlow, Lord Minto, etc., and the policy of non-intervention (1805-11)—Results of the policy of non-intervention (1815-1818)—Lord Hastings' Plan of Confederacy—Nature of early negotiations with Jaipur—Jaipur and Treaty of 1818—Treaty with Jodhpur (1818)—Treaty with Bikaner (1818)—Treaty with Udaipur (1818)—The treaties and its operation (1818-1825)—Tod's Kaul-namah—Interference in Jaipur—Interference in Kota—Interference in Alwar—Interference in Bharatpur—Interference in Jodhpur—Interference in Bikaner—British policy after 1825—Bentinck's policy—The Ajmer Darbar (1832)—Re-organisation of the British administration—Policy of Lord Dalhousie and the Princes of Rajasthan—General observations.	
II	MUTINY AND RAJASTAN—1857
Administrative and Military Control of Britain—First Intelligence of the Meerut and Delhi out-breaks—Active co-operation of the Native Rulers with the British—Mutiny at Nasirabad again—Disturbances at Neemuch again—Mandasor Rebels march towards Neemuch—Jodhpur Legion Company mutinied at Abu—Mutineers and their activities at Awa—A.G.G. proceeds with a force against Awa—Second attack on Awa—British atrocities at Awa and other	48-78

places—Murder of Major Burton—Rebels rule Kota for five months—Re-taking of Kota—Tantia Tope in Rajasthan—Tantia's final defeat and trial—Disturbances at other places in Rajasthan—Attitude of the Princes—Suppression of the mutiny by the Britishers—The Character of the outbreak of mutiny in Rajasthan.

III AGE OF REFORMS AND SEEDS OF REAL AWAKENING (1858-1884) 79-115

Queen's Proclamation (1858)—The Princes and the Proclamation—Administrative Reforms in the Indian States on the British Indian pattern—Reforms in Mewar—Uproar in Udaipur—Hartal of 1864—Col. Eden assaulted—Second strike in Udaipur—Jat agitation in Udaipur—British interference in Bikaner—Administrative Reforms in Bikaner—Reforms in Jodhpur—Political regeneration—Reforms in Jaipur—Reforms in Kota—Ajmer Darbar (1870)—Visit of Prince of Wales (1875)—Imperial Assembledge at Delhi (1877) and Native States—Kota Sardars boycotted the occasion—Afghan War (1875-79)—Co-operation of the Native Princes—Swami Dayanand and Arya Samaj movement—Swami Dayanand and the Princes of Rajasthan—Dayanand's teachings to the Princes and the people of Rajasthan—Influence of the movement.

IV THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AND RAJASTHAN (1885-1924) 116-161

Birth of National Congress—Congress Committee founded in Ajmer—Birth of Journalism in Rajasthan and their impact—Murder of Commissioner Rand—Involvement of Shyamaji Krishna Varma—Swadeshi movement in Rajasthan—Delhi Darbar (1903)—Partition of Bengal (1905)—Precautionary measures adopted by Rajput Princes against sedition—Attitude of Maharaja Alwar—Revolutionary activities in Rajasthan—Arjun Lal Sethi and his revolutionary group—Nimej murder case—Delhi conspiracy case—Arrest of Arjun Lal Sethi—Kesri Singh Barhat and Kota group of revolutionaries—Murder of Sadhu at Kota—Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa and revolutionaries—Plot of a revolt during the First World War—Rao's escape from Todgarh and recapture—Activities of Pratap Singh Barhat and Sachindra Nath Sanyal—Arrest of Pratap Singh Barhat—Ram Narain Chowdhry and his

activities—First World War and the Indian attitude—Response from the Native States—Montford Reforms and Indian States—Chamber of Princes—Congress activities after the First World War—‘Rajasthan Kesi’ and ‘Larun Rajasthan’—Political activities in Ajmer—Rajasthan-Madhya Bharat Sabha—Rajasthan Seva Sangh—Attitude of the Indian National Congress (1921-24)—Bijolia movement (1913-1922)—Bengu agitation—Agitation in Bundi—Unrest in Shekhawati—Students’ agitation in Bharatpur—General observations.

V

THE BHIL MOVEMENTS

162—186

Bhils and their racial character—New reforms and the Bhil rising of 1881-82—Colonel Blain makes an enquiry—Bhil outrages in Dungarpur—Bhil raids on Mewar—Mahikanta border—Dispute between Mewar and Dungarpur Bhils—Motilal Tejawat and the Bhils—Bhil risings of 1922—Arrest and release of Motilal Tejawat—Missionary activities and the Bhils—Vanyasi Seva Sangh—Observations on Bhil risings.

VI

POLITICAL MOVEMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN RAJASTHAN (1924-1939)

187—227

Political Movements in the States of Rajasthan—Alwar—Neemuchana tragedy—The Meo agitation—Agitation for a Better Government—Agitation in Sikar—Demand for the responsible government—Agitation in Jaipur—Observation of Moti Lal Day—Jaipur Praja Mandal and its activities—Civil Disobedience Movement—Agitation in Bharatpur—Abdication by the Maharaja of Bharatpur—Jat Mahasabha Agitation—Bharatpur Praja Mandal and Civil Disobedience Movement—Agitation in Bikaner—The Bikaner Conspiracy Case—Agitation in Jodhpur—Arrest of Jai Narain Vyas and others—Civil Disobedience Movement—The Repression—Jodhpur Praja Mandal—Agitation in Udaipur—Bijolia Movement—Role of Hari Bhau Upadhyaya—Disturbances in Udaipur—Mewar Praja Mandal—Civil Disobedience Movement—Arrest of Manikya Lal Varma—Civil Disobedience Movement and Ajmer—Terrorist activities in Rajasthan—Arrest and release of Pandit Jwala Prasad.

Chapter		Pages
VII	AWAKENING AND THE MERGER (1939-1947)	228-267
	The out-break of the Second World War—Attitude of the Princes of Rajasthan—Ajmer—Celebrations of Independence Day—Hauling down of Congress Flag—Strike in Railway Workshop—Arrest of Pandit Jwala Prashad—His escape from Central Jail—Civil Disobedience Movement—Jaipur—Agitation for responsible government—Constitutional Reforms—Udaipur—The Satyagraha Movement—Constitutional Reforms—Bikaner—Movement for responsible government—Peasants' agitation—Raisingh Nagar Tragedy—Bharatpur—Agitation for responsible government—Alwar—Agitation for popular government—Kota—Agitation for responsible government—Sirohi and Dungarpur—Movement for responsible government—Jaisalmer—Jawahar Day—Arrest of Raghunath Singh Mehta—Establishment of Praja Mandal—Arrest of Sagar Mal Gopa—Death of Sagar Mal Gopa—Praja Mandal's activities—Jodhpur—Agitation for responsible government—Responsible Government Day and Chandawal Tragedy—Satyagraha Movement—The suppression—Death of Balmukund Bisa—August 1942 and After—Dabra agitation—Merger of the Rajputana States—General observations.	
VIII	THE EPILOGUE	268-273
	Appendices	274-275
	Bibliography	276-280
	Index	281-283

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—SEEDS OF UNREST

Political awakening in a country is not the result of sudden growth. It takes a long period, rather centuries, to develop. In India, as in Great Britain, France and Germany, political awakening took a long time and was the result of a long struggle and continuous warfare. The same has been true of the States in Rajasthan which stood against the early Arab and Turk rulers and then against Mughal imperialism for maintaining their independence. Later, during East India Company's rule and after, the same spirit worked against the British in Rajasthan. No doubt, the Rajput Princes and their followers were not fully aware of the present day interpretation of independence and nationality but it must be admitted that the Rajputs fought on several occasions till the last drop of their blood for the sake of their patrimony. They strove to preserve their individuality and identify themselves with the land in their clanish loyalty engendered the feeling of local patriotism.

Survey of mediaeval warfares in Rajasthan

The History of India in general and the history of Rajasthan in particular has been a history of sacrifice and love for traditions. This tradition of chivalry has been maintained almost by every Rajput ruler and particularly by the Mewar princes. In this respect, Bapa's name occupies the pre-eminent place in the history of Mewar, who successfully repelled the Arab invaders in the 8th century A.D.¹ During the time of

1. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, p. 8; Tod, James: *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, p. 294.

Allauddin's invasion Rana Ratan Singh, with his gallant followers, offered a heroic and tough resistance and met a heroic death for the cause of his race. The glory of Mewar reached its zenith when Kumbha became the ruler in 1433 A.D. 'He earned fame by his victories over the enemies of his race, by building a line of gigantic forts to strengthen the defences of Mewar and by keeping a political and military balance between the provincial kingdoms of Malwa and Gujarat.'²

In the beginning of the 16th century Rana Sanga fought a battle with Ibrahim Lodi at Baksorle and successfully met the forces of Sultans of Gujarat and Malwa. He also defeated successfully the Sultan of Mandu (Mandu II) in 1519, maintaining the heroism of the Rajput community. Of course, in the battle of Khanwa, he failed because he had nothing to compare with Babur's artillery and ultimately Babur won the battle.³ Maharana Pratap (1572-1597) and Rana Raj Singh (1652-1680) both stood for the traditional Rajput glory and continued to fight against the Mughals. Both of them, therefore, occupy a significant place in our history and have been a source of inspiration for the statesman and the soldier alike.

Equally patent were the virtues of the Rajputani who showed wonderful courage and dogged determination in times of peril. "The true mark of honour and chastity of these great women is discernible in the frightful 'jauhars' when they embraced death with courage and hope, when the relentless invaders were encircling their homes and when all opportunities of deliverance were lost."⁴ The most potent factor that kept the Rajputs engaged for generations in a war against foreign power was the force of the tradition of resistance. "This gave to the rulers and the people a sense of self-respect

2. *Kirti Stambh inscription V.S. 1517*; Beyley: *History of Gujarat*, p. 4149; Sarda: *Maharana Kumbha*, pp. 93-106, 120-162.

3. Beveridge: *Baburnama*, Vol. II, pp. 593-94; Tod, James: *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 349; Ojha, G. H.: *Udaipur Rajya Ka Itihas*, p. 351.

4. Sharma, G. N.: *Mewar and the Mughal Emperors*, p. 5.

and confidence which supported them in many a dark hour of their history.”

Marwar

Like the heroic traditions of Mewar, the rulers in Marwar too maintained the Rajput glory by facing the Arab, Turk and Mughal invaders. Rao Maldeo, Chandra Sen, Maharaja Jaswant Singh and Vir Durgadas were among those who respectively challenged the mighty Afghan and Mughal powers, fighting heroically against heavy odds.

Though, Maharaja Jaswant Singh also played an important role, his diplomacy could not achieve any success during the war of succession at Dharmat⁵ nor could he fulfil his promise to help Dara at Ajmer in the war of succession against Aurangzib.⁶ For this action J. N. Sarkar rightly observes: “A Rajput of the highest rank and fame had turned false to his word of all the actors in the drama of the War of Succession. Jaswant emerges from it with the worst reputation.”⁷ But Vir Durgadas washed this black spot and once again established the Rajput glory by securing and protecting Prince Ajit Singh from the span of mighty Aurangzib.⁸ He bravely fought against the mighty Mughals and even ‘Mughal gold could not reduce and Mughal arms could not daunt that constant heart.’⁹ Almost alone among the Rathors, he displayed the rare combination of the dash and reckless valour of a Rajput soldier with the tact, diplomacy and organising power of a Mughal Minister of State. These are the reasons why the Rathor bard¹⁰

5. Sharma, G. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.

6. Khafi Khan, Muhammad Hashim: *Muntakhab-ul-Lubab*, Elliot, H. H.: *History of India*, Vol. VII, p. 219; Sarkar, J. N.: *History of Aurangzib*, Vol. III, p. 21.

7. *Muntakhab-ul-Lubab*; Elliot, H. H.: *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, p. 219; Sarkar, J. N.: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 170.

8. Sarkar, J. N.: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 170-171.

9. *Muntakhab-ul-Lubab*, Elliot, H. H.: *History of India*, Vol. VII, p. 301.

10. Sarkar, J. N.: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 331.

11. “Eh, mata put esa jan, jesa Durgadas”, a very familiar bardic couplet.

prayed that every Rajput mother might have a son like Durgadas.

Moral degradation of the Princes in Rajasthan

After the death of Rana Raj Singh and Maharaja Jaswant Singh, the contest for primacy emerged in the Rajput politics in the middle of the 18th century which ended only with the total ruin and humiliation of this race. At this juncture, there was no such superior power which could protect the lawful rights of the Princes or protect them against personal conflicts and wars.

In this state of affairs, the Maratha and Pindari penetration posed a direct challenge to the ruling princes. The defeat of Budh Singh at the hands of Marathas opened the eyes of the more thoughtful princes to their helpless condition.¹² In view of all this, in the second half of October, 1734, Maharaja Jai Singh of Jaipur called a conference of all the Rajas at Hurda (a village in Mewar) to find out the measures and means for keeping the Marathas and Pindaris out of their principalities.¹³

British attitude towards the Rajputana States (1803-1805): The policy of British protection

When Rajputana was facing the Maratha and Pindari attacks, the British attitude towards the Rajput States was not without significance. After the treaty of Bassin (December, 1802), Lord Wellesley aimed at the 'extension of British territory to the Jamuna and British influence to the borders of Deccan.'¹⁴ He believed that the British should follow the policy of intervention in the affairs of the States. He thought that 'these States would graciously co-operate with the British, once they were released from the terror of Maratha reprisals.'¹⁵

12. Surajmal: *Vansh Bhaskar*, Part IV, p. 3185.

13. Surajmal: *op. cit.*, p. 3227.

14. Letter dated 18th July, 1803, from Governor-General to Lord Lake, F. & P. dated 2nd March, 1804, No. 3, S.C., NAI.

15. Letter dated 18th July, 1803, from Governor-General to Lord Lake, *op. cit.*, NAI.

He knew that the Rajput States had been suffering since long under Scindhia's yoke and were paying heavy tribute for keeping their frontiers safer from the Maratha raids. They were helpless to check this aggression themselves and in order to deal effectively with this menace, co-operation from some foreign power was absolutely essential for them. This explains why the Governor-General was so hopeful of the Rajput chief's willingness to enter into his system of defensive alliances." He was further very much anxious to take such States under British protection because the secret military routes which were the very life-lines of the British Empire in Western India traversed through Rajputana. The principal among these were: (i) from Delhi via Jaipur to Mhow; (ii) From Agra via Jaipur to Ajmer; (iii) From Agra via Jaipur to Neemuch; and (iv) From Kaldri to Neemuch." In 1803, therefore, an extensive diplomatic authority was conferred upon General Lake to consummate treaties with the Chiefs of Rajputana and he was assured that Jaipur and Jodhpur will readily connect themselves with the British Government, for the purpose of emancipating themselves from the oppressive control of Marathas." Lord Wallesley, commenting on the deplorable condition of the Rajput, the Sikh and the Maratha States, had apprehended that 'they could easily fall victims of an aggression from the enterprising spirit of France, or the ambition of Russia, or even the violence and capacity of the Afghan tribes or of other Asiatic nation inhabiting the northern and western countries of Asia.' It is also a fact that Governor-General knew that the success of the campaign against the Marathas depended upon the assistance or at least the neutrality of these powers, and the independence

16. Letter dated 8th December, 1803, from Lord Lake to Wallesley. *Wallesley Despatches*, Vol. III, p. 495.

17. Thornton: *Gazetteer of territories under the East India Company*, Vol. II, p. 288.

18. Letter dated 27th and 28th July, 1803, from Lord Wallesley to Lord Lake, *Wallesley Despatches*, Vol. III, pp. 234-35.

19. Instructions to Lord Lake included in a despatch to the Secret Committee dated 13th July, 1804, vide, *Wallesley Despatches*, Vol. IV, p. 136.

of the Rajput chiefs would constitute a power, which would form the best security to the north-west frontier of British Empire in India. This policy, usually described as 'subsidiary alliance', was responsible for the conclusion of treaties with Jaipur, Jodhpur, Alwar and Bharatpur.

Treaty with Jaipur (1803)

Constantly ravaged by the troops of Scindhia and Holkar, Jaipur willingly accepted and signed the settlement undertaken by General Lake on 12th December, 1803, which was ratified by Lord Wallesley on 15th January, 1804.²⁰ The treaty consisted of seven articles. The first two were subsequently the same as proposed earlier in the preliminary draft in July. The third removed the Raja's fears about the possibility of British interference in his internal affairs and exempted him from the payment of tribute. The sixth article provided for Jaipur's co-operation in War and the seventh bound the Raja against giving appointment to Europeans, without the consent of the British Government. Perhaps, it was meant to check the French intrigues.²¹

Treaty with Jodhpur (1803)

In 1803, the Governor-General despatched a letter to the Maharaja Bhim Singh of Jodhpur through Lord Lake, the Commander-in-Chief of the British forces, containing preliminary articles intended to form the basis of the treaty of defensive alliance.²² It was during the last days of Maharaja Bhim Singh that the British treaty proposals were received. But due to his sudden and unexpected demise in 1803, no immediate notice could be taken of the British offer. His successor Man Singh, whose position was then critical owing to the internal troubles created by Sawai Singh's intrigues, was ap-

20. Letter dated 27th June, 1803, from Lord Wallesley to Major-General Wallesley, W. D., Vol. III, p. 157.

21. Letter dated 8th December, 1803, from Lord Lake to Wallesley. *Wallesley Despatches*, Vol. III, p. 495.

22. Aitchison: *Engagements, Treaties and Sanads*, Vol. III, p. 66.

parently willing to enter into the friendly alliance with the British Government. He deputed his Vakil Fateh Ram, an able and confidential servant, to conduct negotiations with the British Government. Accordingly, both agreed on the terms of the proposed treaty on 22nd December, 1803. The terms of the treaty were similar to those granted by Lord Lake to Jaipur. It was agreed that the friends and enemies of one party were to be considered the friends and enemies of both. According to it, the Maharaja was to co-operate with his entire force in a manner to be suggested by the Commander-in-Chief of the British army on the field. The British guaranteed the Maharaja his possessions and engaged 'to secure his just rights and independence against the attempt of any State or power to injure or invade them.' Further, the Maharaja was to engage himself to conclude a treaty of perpetual defensive alliances on such terms as to be agreed upon later.

Treaty with Alwar (1803)

The next treaty was concluded in 1803 with the State of Alwar. The first four articles were the same as those of Jaipur. The fifth article of the treaty shows the expanding political vision of the British authorities, according to which the Maharaja of Alwar was bound to submit his disputes with other States to the arbitration of the British Government.²³

Treaty with Bharatpur (1805)

During his march on Agra, Lord Lake concluded a de-

23. Letter dated 22nd July, 1804, from J. Monckson, Assistant Personal Secretary to the Maharaja of Jodhpur, F. & P. dated 2nd March, 1804, No. 2C.—S.C. NAI.

Letter from Maharaja Man Singh to Lord Lake received on 8th December, 1803, F. & P. dated 2nd March, 1804, No. 185—A.S.C. NAI.

24. Letter from Maharaja Man Singh to Lord Lake received on 8th December, 1803, F. & P. dated 2nd March, 1804, No. 185—A.S.C. NAI.

25. Aitchison: *Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads*, Vol. III.

fensive alliance with the Maharaja of Bharatpur. The treaty,²⁶ signed on 17th April, 1805, consisted of four articles. It established perpetual friendship and alliance between the two States and in case of foreign invasion, each party was bound to defend the territory of the other. The British Government promised not to interfere in the internal affairs of the Raja and not to have any tribute paid by him.

Observations on the policy of Lord Wallesley

Although the treaties (1803-1805) ratified by the Governor-General guaranteed the security of the States against external enemies, and assured a firm and permanent friendship of alliance, they, curiously enough, also suggested that they would ultimately lead to the limiting of the authority of the rulers in Rajasthan. The two leading rulers of Rajputana, Maharaja Jagat Singh of Jaipur, and Maharaja Man Singh of Jodhpur, were not insensible to the gradual establishment of British ascendancy in their States. Hardly the ink on the treaties had dried up that they showed signs of uneasiness towards the yoke of British power. This is evident from a letter of Captain Sturrock, Acting Resident of Jaipur, who reported to the Governor-General in 1808, that the rulers of Jaipur, Jodhpur and Udaipur were willing to form an anti-British coalition.²⁷ Though this sort of belief was denied by Col. Tod, it is a fact that Maharaja Jagat Singh evaded the duty of sending military aid to the East India Company against Holkar.²⁸ Maharaja Man Singh, on his part, entered into negotiations with Holkar, helped him by giving shelter to his family and refused to ratify the treaty.²⁹ How far these actions vindicated their

26. *Ibid.*

27. Letter from Captain Sturrock, Acting Resident of Jaipur, to the Governor-General, F. & P. Secret consultation, 11th July, 1805, No. 2. NAI.

28. Letter dated 2nd October 1805, Lord Lake to Maharaja Jaipur, F. & P. dated 17th October, 1805, No. 94A, S.C., NAI.

29. Letter dated 7 April, 1804, from General Lake to Wallesley, F. & P. dated 6th September, 1804, No. 1, S.C. NAI; F. & P. dated 14th June, 1804, 56A, S.C. NAI.

claims for open resentment against the British authority may be challenged, but this much is certain that the Maharajas had not proved themselves over-zealous allies of the British Government. A sense of awareness in the princes at least existed with the dawn of ascendancy of British Power.

As regards the Marathas, Lord Lake failed to check their growing influence in Rajasthan. Colonel Manson's advances into the interior of Rajasthan had to face a disastrous retreat in 1804 and the four successive assaults of Lord Lake did not turn well.³⁰ The losses and difficulties involved in these operations brought a serious blow to British prestige.

Thus, Wallesley's policy received a severe jolt from the reverses in war with Holkar and Scindhia. His calculations regarding the attitude of the princes of Rajasthan had also no promising prospects. The Court of Directors too did not appreciate the Governor-General's services. He was soon replaced by Lord Cornwallis on 30th July, 1805.

Lord Cornwallis, Sir George Barlow, Lord Minto, etc., and Policy of non-intervention (1805-1811)

Lord Cornwallis, who was sent with definite instruction to follow the policy of non-involvement, attempted to withdraw from the responsibilities of protection, and leave the princes of Rajasthan to their own fate. Accordingly, he ordered Lord Lake to stop all aggressive military actions.³¹ Captain Sturrock was instructed to desist from giving any help to the Maharaja of Jaipur, if Marathas attacked.³² He also decided that Alwar, Bharatpur and Dholpur should also be persuaded to agree to the dissolution of their connections with the British Government in exchange for British territories beyond the Jamuna.³³ But Lord Cornwallis died on 5th October, 1805, before he could im-

30. *Ibid.*

31. Letter dated 30th July, 1805, from Lord Cornwallis to Lord Lake, Ross: *Correspondence of Cornwallis* (1859), Vol. III, p. 533.

32. Malcolm: *Political History of India*, p. 407.

33. Letter dated 14th August, 1805, from Lord Cornwallis to Malcolm, Ross: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 541.

plement his views effectively regarding the removal of British protection from several Rajput States. The charge now, therefore, devolved upon George Barlow, who also adopted the views of his predecessor. Lord Minto substituted George Barlow in 1807 and came to India, believing in the policy of non-intervention. However, he modified his policy by abandoning the strictest interpretation of non-interference.

Results of the policy of non-interference

During the period beginning from 1805 to 1811, British Government did not go beyond the plans of Lord Cornwallis. The alliances with Alwar, Bharatpur and Dholpur were retained. But the other States were not only left to look after themselves, but even the British Government in its treaties with Scindhia and Holkar specifically recognised Mewar, Jodhpur, Kota, Bundi and other States, south of the river Chambal, as spheres of Maratha influence and bound itself against interference in their affairs.³⁴

However, the British withdrawal from holding responsibilities of protection to the Chiefs plunged Rajputana in incessant warfare. Scindhia and Holkar were now definitely powerless to establish themselves in Rajputana but the Rajput princes incapable of taking advantage of the weakness of the Marathas failed to strengthen themselves. On the contrary, they plunged their States into anarchy on account of their mutual rivalries. For instance, in Krishna Kumari case when the concerned parties (Jaipur and Jodhpur) applied for the British support, the British Government in view of non-interference policy and of its treaties with Maratha power, refused to involve itself. Not only the applications of the several princes for assistance were rejected but British allies were also told to keep aloof from all quarrels.³⁵ The British policy thus proved a boon to the Pin-

34. Sardesai, G. S.: *New History of Marathas*, Vol. III, p. 435.

35. Letter dated 28th December, 1806, from A. Seton to Edmonstone, F. & P. dated 15th January, 1807, No. 6 P.C. NAI; Letter dated 20th February, 1807, from A. Seton, Resident at Delhi to Edmon-

daris and Pathan soldiers of fortune. Condition of external anarchy now prevailed and administrative and political structure of the Rajputana States completely broke down. Such was the condition of Rajasthan when Lord Hastings took over as the Governor-General in India in 1813.³⁶

Lord Hastings and British Policy of non-intervention reversed (1815-1818)

Sir Charles Metcalfe, since his assumption of the charge of the Delhi Residency, had been endeavouring to effect a radical change in the British policy towards Rajput States. He, in 1811, suggested a confederation of Rajput States under the protection of British Government which would deprive the predatory forces of "their principal resources for ravage and plunder" and would result in the establishment of permanent peace.³⁷ With regard to the petty States of Rajputana and Central India, he had a benevolent attitude. He pressed for it, more as "an object of wise and liberal policy" than as a measure indispensable for the interests of the British Government. Among the advantages, he emphasised that of securing 'the political attachment and dependence of established Governments', and thereby the extension and confirmation of the British power and supremacy, ahead of material gains.³⁸

Metcalfe's ideas helped Lord Hastings, the Governor-General, to formulate a general plan for the expansion of British Dominion. On 1st December, 1815, the Governor-General

(Contd. from previous page)

stone, F. & P. dated 12th March, 1807, No. 26, P.C. NAI; Letter dated 18th February, 1810, from A. Seton to Edmonstone, F. & P. dated 6th March, 1810, No. 15, F.C. NAI; Letter dated 19th May, 1810, from A. Seton to Charles Lushington, Acting Secretary to Government, F. & P. dated 5th June, 1810, No. 53 F.C., NAI.

36. Mehta, M.S.: *Lord Hastings and Indian States*, p. 12.

37. Letter dated 20th June, 1811, from Metcalfe to Edmonstone, F. & P. dated 12th July, 1811, No. 1, S.C., NAI.

38. Metcalfe's memo. on Central India; Kaye, John William: *The Life and Correspondence of Metcalfe*, Vol. I, pp. 313-25.

submitted to the Council one of the lengthiest minutes ever recorded by a Governor-General.³⁹ In this minute, he unfolded his complete plan for the extirpation of the Pindaris and the Pathans; for taking the petty States under protection and for over-hauling the political situation in India so as to render it more secure for the British Power.⁴⁰ Therefore, the ultimate object with which the British Government started negotiations with the Rajput powers, was "to establish a barrier against the revival of the predatory system or the extension of the power of Scindhia and Holkar beyond the limits assigned to it...."⁴¹ The Governor-General hoped that the Rajput co-operation would prevent the Pindaris from re-assembling and invading the British territories.⁴² There was yet one more advantage of taking these States under protection. The pecuniary contributions from the States would have relieved the Government of the expenses of maintaining a force sufficient to maintain tranquillity in those territories.⁴³

Lord Hastings' Plan of Confederacy

Lord Hastings wanted to control the political relations of these States with each other and with the foreign States. The plan of forming a confederacy of Indian States under the British protection was, therefore, suggested by the Governor-General as it denoted a close connection between the British Government in India and these States.⁴⁴ A variety of common features among the various States of Rajputana, such as race, religion, social and political structures made its implementation easier

39. Governor-General's Minutes dated 1st December, 1815, F. & P. dated 16th June, 1816, No. 5, F.C. NAI.

40. Governor-General's Minutes dated 1st December, 1815, *op. cit.*, NAI.

41. Letter dated 8th October, 1817, from John Adam to C. T. Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 28th October, 1817, No. 26, S.C. NAI.

42. Letter dated 19th May, 1818, to Court of Directors, NAI.

43. Letter dated 8th October, 1817, from Adam to Metcalfe, *op. cit.*, NAI.

44. Governor-General's Minutes dated 3rd April, 1817, F. & P. dated 21st June, 1817, No. 4, S.C. NAI.

in Rajputana than anywhere else. With all these things in mind, Lord Hastings considered the idea of establishing a confederacy of at least three major States of Rajputana, viz., Jaipur, Jodhpur and Udaipur. But at the same time, it was realised that its implementation would be difficult due to the feelings of pride and jealousy amongst themselves.⁴⁵ Metcalfe also agreed to this view and accordingly he negotiated with them separately.⁴⁶ We select a few of the treaties and assess their consequences.

Nature of early negotiations with Jaipur

Several stages of negotiations before finalization of Jaipur Treaty of 1818 suggested that the Vakils of Maharaja Jagat Singh attempted to find out ways and means to make the treaty advantageous for their master both from monetary and prestige points of view. The Vakil of Jaipur told Metcalfe during the negotiations of 1816 that for complete obedience and subserviency of the Court, his master was not willing to accede.⁴⁷ In a long despatch, dated 7th August, 1816, Metcalfe rightly hinted that the Ministers of Jaipur had not yet made up their minds as to the terms on which they should enter the proposed alliance. He further pointed out that for a few days the Vakils even omitted their ordinary visits on stated days.⁴⁸ Similarly there were objections to the arrangement about the payment previously decided upon.⁴⁹

In spite of these obstacles to the treaties in initial stage it was advantageous for the British that the position of Jaipur was becoming worse day by day. There was no unity even in the capital of Maharaja Jagat Singh. Rai Chand Singh, the principal Commander of Jaipur, was pro-British and his suc-

45. Letter dated 8th October, 1817, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 28th October, 1817, No. 26, S.C. NAI.

46. Letter dated 18th October, 1817, from Metcalfe to Adam, F. & P. dated 14th November, 1817, No. 50, S.C. NAI.

47. F. & P. dated 15th April, 1816, No. 45, S.C. NAI.

48. F. & P. dated 7th September, 1816, No. 5, S.C. NAI.

49. F. & P. dated 7th September, 1816, No. 5, S.C. NAI.

cessor Ganesh Narayan was most enthusiastically bent on the formation of an alliance with the British.⁵⁰

Jaipur and Treaty of 1818

After long deliberations of British representatives and representatives of the Maharaja, treaty was signed in Delhi on 2nd April, 1818, and ratified by Lord Hastings on 15th April, 1818. It provided 'perpetual friendship, alliance and unity of interest between the parties'. The British Government took the responsibility of protecting the territory of Jaipur and the Maharaja had to promise to act in subordinate co-operation with the British Government, to acknowledge its supremacy and to maintain no diplomatic relations with other Chiefs and States without the knowledge and sanction of the British Government.⁵¹ A tribute in gradual process was fixed in accordance with the estimated revenue of the State. The Maharaja was required, according to the treaty, to furnish a quota of troops at the requisition of the British Government. The British Government, on its part, acknowledged the ruler and his heir as the absolute rulers of their territory free from the obligation of introducing British Civil and Criminal Laws within their territory.⁵²

Treaty with Jodhpur (1818)

In order to get himself free from the destructive effects of the direct interference of the Pindaris and Marathas, in 1818, Maharaja Man Singh, again tried to negotiate with the British. Accordingly, a treaty comprising ten articles was signed on 6th January, 1818, and was duly ratified by the Maharaja of Jodhpur and the Governor-General.⁵³ The treaty provided "perpetual friendship, alliance and unity of interests." The British undertook to protect the principality and territory of Jodhpur and the Maharaja promised "to act in subordinate

50. F. & P. dated 12th October, 1816, No. 16, S.C. NAI.

51. Letter dated 20th April, 1816, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 20th April, 1816, Sec. Cons., NAI.

52. Letter dated 20th April, 1816, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 20th April, 1816, S.C., NAI.

53. Aitchison: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 128-129, and 159-161.

co-operation with the British Government.” It was provided that all disputes between Marwar and other States would be submitted to “the arbitration and award” of the British Government. Article 9 provided that Man Singh would remain “absolute ruler” of his country and that the jurisdiction of the British Government would not be introduced into Jodhpur.⁵⁴ But, when the Jodhpur Vakils requested Metcalfe to promise that the British Government would not listen to the Raj’s relatives or Rajput Thakurs of the State if they submitted “self-interested proposals”, Metcalfe replied that this was “understood” in 9th Article of the treaty.⁵⁵

Treaty with Bikaner (1818)

Taking advantage of Charles Metcalfe’s circular letter⁵⁶ calling upon all the Rajput Chiefs to depute Vakils in order to negotiate treaties with the British Government, Maharaja Surat Singh of Bikaner deputed Ojha Kashinath to wait on the Resident and the treaty was finally concluded on 9th March, 1818.⁵⁷ Since the British territory of Hariyana had a common border with Bikaner and the rebellious and lawless activities of Bikaner Thakurs sometimes extended to British areas also, Metcalfe decided to take this State under British protection.⁵⁸

The treaty had some novel feature. According to the treaty, as the Raja was not very powerful to suppress the lawless activities, the British Government agreed to provide him troops to suppress the rebel chiefs, the expenses of which were to be borne by the Raja.⁵⁹ The British Government had not committed in this way with any other State but Metcalfe justified the objection on the ground that the objective of the treaty was to

54. *Ibid.*

55. F. & P. dated 6th February, 1818, No. 102, S.C. NAI.

56. Kaye, John William: *The Life and Correspondence of Charles Lord Metcalfe*, Vol. I, p. 465.

57. Aitchison: *op cit.*, Vol. III, p. 288.

58. Letter dated 8th October, 1817, from J. Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 28th October, 1817, No. 26, S.C. NAI.

59. Aitchison: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 288.

establish internal peace and tranquillity⁶⁰ and was approved by the Governor-General.⁶¹

Treaty with Udaipur (1818)

When the State of Mewar entered into the treaty relations with the British Government in 1818, it was a very critical movement of its period. For more than half a century, the hordes of Holkar, Scindhia and Amir Khan had trodden, devastated and ravaged the land of Mewar. The result has been that the Maharana's rule had become limited to the valley of Udaipur city only.⁶² The position of Maharana became so pitiable that at times, he had to depend upon Zalim Singh, the Regent of Kota, for his personal expenses.⁶³ In short, as a result of the ravaging activities of the Chiefs of Mewar, Bhils, Meenas and Meos, Mewar was in a state of chaos by the beginning of the 19th Century.⁶⁴

Under the circumstances, Maharana Bhim Singh of Udaipur tried to seek assistance from the British. 'When the British Government decided to crush the Marathas and the Pindaris, it was an opportunity to conclude a treaty with the State. Accordingly, on 13th July, 1818, the treaty of friendship, alliance and unity was concluded⁶⁵ by which the British Government engaged itself "to protect the principality and territory of Mewar" and to use its best exertions for the restitution of those territories which had been seized by others.⁶⁶ It was not unmixed with self-interest as the British Government directly shared in the increase of Mewar's revenues.⁶⁷

60. Letter dated 20th March, 1818, from Metcalfe to Adam, F. & P. dated 10th April, 1818, No. 23, S.C., NAI.

61. Letter dated 4th April, 1818, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 1st May, 1818, No. 16, S.C., NAI.

62. *Ibid.*

63. Erskine, K. D.: *A Gazetteer of the Udaipur State*, p. 25.

64. Tod, James: *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 378.

65. Aitchison: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 17-18.

66. Aitchison: *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 22.

67. Letter dated 2nd February, 1818, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 6th March, 1818, No. 5, S. C. NAI.

The Maharana, on his part, agreed to act always in 'subordinate co-operation' with the British Government and acknowledge its supremacy, while maintaining his sovereignty in his own country, to abstain from political correspondence with other Chiefs or States and to pay the yearly tribute to the British Government amounting to one-fourth of the revenues of the State for five years and after that term three-eighths in perpetuity.⁶⁸ Thus the treaty of 1818 concluded and was verified by the Maharana and the British Government.

The general object of the British Government in concluding treaties with these States was "to establish a barrier against the revival of predatory system or the extension of the power of Scindhia and Holkar beyond the limits to be assigned to them." This object could be achieved by subjecting the foreign relations of the petty States to the British control. In return the British Government had to guarantee their territorial integrity and independence. As the interest of the parties was served, these States were to help the British Government with their military resources.⁶⁹ Lord Hastings' policy thus emphasised the British paramountcy with regard to the Indian States with a great force and determination. The clauses of treaties like "will always act in subordinate co-operation with the British Government", "will not have any connection with other States", "will not enter into any negotiation without the knowledge", etc., were, more or less, an open surrender of personal independence and individuality in matters of political importance.

But the treaties of 1818 concluded with the States of Rajputana failed to establish peace and tranquillity in the State due to the strained relations between the Maharajas and the Chiefs. Lord Hastings, therefore, in order to suppress the quarrels sanctioned "some degree of interference to the extent of advice and partial assistance."⁷⁰

68. Aitchison, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 17-18.

69. Letter dated 8th October, 1817, from J. Adam to Metcalfe. F. & P. dated 28th October, 1817, No. 26, S.C. NAI.

70. Letter dated 27th March, 1818, from J. Adam to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 24th April, 1818, Para 18, NAI.

lands of the equal value before appointing a new Pradhan.⁸² With this clash between the Maharana and the British Government, the dissatisfied Chiefs again raised the slogan against the State. Ochterlony, therefore, advised the British Government to allow him more interference in affairs of the State⁸³ which was approved by the Governor-General in council.⁸⁴

But when in 1823, Capt. Cobbe took over from Col. Tod as the Political Agent in Mewar to improve the relations between the Maharana and the British Government, he recommended a liberal attitude towards the Maharana.⁸⁵ He also suggested that the British Government should take an instalment of Rs. 1,25,000 per annum instead of Rs. 2,25,000 on account of the arrears of the tribute.⁸⁶ Both these recommendations were accepted by the British Government⁸⁷ and thus Capt. Cobbe succeeded in establishing his control over the Mewar with great satisfaction.⁸⁸

Interference in Jaipur

After signing of the treaty of 1818 with Jaipur Ochterlony ordered Amir Khan to withdraw his troops from Jaipur territories.⁸⁹ But as soon as the troops of Amir Khan withdrew, the problem of Khalsa lands began at the Jaipur court. In

82. Letter dated 26th February 1823, from Ochterlony to Maharana Bhim Singh, F. & P. dated 21st March, 1823, No. 42, P.C. NAI.

83. Letter dated 4th September, 1822, from Ochterlony to Swinton, F. & P. dated 2nd November, 1822, No. 7, F.C. NAI.

84. Letter dated 21st March, 1823, from G. Swinton to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 21st March, 1823, No. 50, P.C. NAI.

85. Letter dated 18th September, 1823 from M. A. Cabbe to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 21 November, 1823, No. 9, P.C., NAI.

86. Letter dated 4th September, 1822 from Ochterlony to G. Swinton. F. & P. dated 2nd November, 1822, No. 7, P.C., Para 30 to 35, NAI.

87. Letter dated 21st March, 1823, from G. Swinton to D. Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 2nd November, 1823, No. 50, P.C., Para 9 to 11, NAI.

88. Letter dated 20 February, 1825, from Cabbe to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 29th April, 1825, No. 11, P.C. NAI.

89. Letter dated 15th May, 1818 from Ochterlony to J. Adam, F. & P. dated 5th June, 1818, No. 63, S.C., NAI.

order to check further deterioration, Ochterlony marched to Jaipur.⁹⁰ The urgent task before him was to restore the authority of the Maharaja. Like Col. Tod he also drew the Kaulnamah to curb the authorities of the Chiefs.⁹¹ Most of the Thakurs signed the document on 21st June, 1818. But when Thakur Bharat Singh of Madhorajpura refused to surrender the fortress, Ochterlony immediately ordered a detachment of troops under Col. Thompson to cut him to size.⁹² As a result of this not only Bharat Singh quietly submitted but the powerful Chiefs like Rao Raja Laxman Singh of Sikar and Abhey Singh of Khetri also surrendered their usurpations.⁹³ The exercise of British influence in this action was fully approved by the Government.⁹⁴

Problem of Succession

But with this the trouble did not end. Maharaja Jagat Singh died on 21st Dec., 1818, having no son. But Mohan Ram Nazir immediately installed Mohan Singh, the son of Ex-Prince of Narwar whose family was connected with the Royal house. It was declared that Maharaja Jagat Singh on his death-bed had adopted the child and ordered his installation.⁹⁵ In the beginning British Government showed no interest. But soon the anti-Nazir Thakurs began to oppose the right of the successor. They pressed the superior claims of Thakur Bhadur Singh of Jhallya for succession.⁹⁶ The British Government, therefore, demanded

90. Letter dated 21st May, 1818, Ochterlony to J. Adam, F. & P. dated 19th June, 1818, No. 22, S.C. NAI.

91. Letter dated 22nd June, 1818, from Ochterlony to Adam, F. & P. dated 17th July, 1818, No. 42, P.C. NAI.

92. Letter dated 24th July, 1818, from Ochterlony to Adam, F. & P. dated 14th August, 1818, No. 100, P.C. NAI.

93. Letter dated 8th August, 1818, from Ochterlony to Adam, F. & P. dated 29th August, 1818, No. 81, S.C. NAI.

94. Letter dated 14th August, 1818 from Adam to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 14th August, 1818, No. 102, P.C. NAI.

95. Letter dated Nil from Mohan Ram Nazir to Ochterlony, F. & P. Dep'tt., dated 6th February, 1818, No. 45, P.C. NAI.

96. Letter from Thakur Bhadur Singh to Metcalfe recd. on 8th March, 1819, F. & P. Dep'tt., dated 3rd April, 1819, No. 88, P.C. NAI.

more satisfactory proof of the legitimacy of the succession before it could commit itself finally.⁹⁷ To ascertain the true facts Ochterlony decided to call an assembly of Chiefs and issued a circular to them⁹⁸ to this effect. This attitude of the British Government created a critical situation in Jaipur. Ochterlony, therefore, decided to visit the State⁹⁹ but the news of Rani's pregnancy changed the situation considerably. On 25th April, 1819, a posthumous son was born to Maharaja Jagat Singh who was immediately proclaimed under the title of Sawai Jai Singh.¹⁰⁰ She dismissed Mohan Ram who was creating difficulties in the recognition of rights of her son and appointed Joth Ram as the Chief Executive head of the State.

Dismissal of Mohan Ram Nazir and the appointment of a Resident Political Agent

The dismissal of Mohan Ram Nazir by the Regent Rani of the Minor Prince gave a signal to Ochterlony that his personal interference may be ended in the State and so he tried to prevent the dismissal of Mohan Ram Nazir.¹⁰¹ In short Ochterlony showed his inclination to recognise the Regent Rani's sovereign authority only if she was prepared to act according to his wishes. In the meantime Ochterlony had ordered a detachment of troops to be kept in readiness to march to Jaipur if needed.¹⁰² But Regent Rani boldly challenged the British Government for its involvement in the Nazir's case.¹⁰³ She observed

97. Letter dated 20th February, 1819, from Metcalfe to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., dated 20th February, 1819, No. 45, P.C., NAI.

98. Letter dated 21st March, 1819, from Ochterlony to Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 17th April, 1819, No. 30, P.C. NAI.

99. Letter dated 1st April, 1819, from Ochterlony to Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 24th April, 1819, No. 45, P.C. NAI.

100. Letter dated 25th April, 1819, from Ochterlony to Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 22nd May, 1819, No. 29, P.C. NAI.

101. Letter dated 25th April, 1819 from Ochterlony to Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 22nd May, 1819, No. 27, P.C. NAI.

102. Ochterlony's diary dated 25th April, 1819, F. & P. Deptt., dated 29th April, 1819, No. 28, P.C. NAI.

103. Letter dated 2nd May, 1819, from Bhatianee Rani to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., 3rd June, 1819, No. 20, P.C. NAI.

that "the treaty of alliance and friendship was made with the Maharaja's family and not with his servants."¹⁰⁴

However, in order to check the activities of the Rani Ochterlony recommended the appointment of an European Officer to reside at Jaipur to advise the State authorities.¹⁰⁵ The executive powers of the State were vested in Rawal Berisal and Joth Ram was dismissed. Capt. Stewart, the Resident at Jaipur, as instructed, took up the work of revenue administration of the State and issued a proclamation on behalf of the Darbar, notifying its desire to farm the lands for 3 years and extending the security of the British Government within the terms of engagements.¹⁰⁶

Failure of Rawal Bersial and Revolt in Jaipur

In spite of the British support, Rawal Berisal could not show any progress in improving the finances of the State. The army of the Raj were not paid for a year and there was resentment. The four battalions stationed at Torawati, therefore, revolted and arrested their officers and marched towards Jaipur demanding their pay.¹⁰⁷ This created a conflict between the supporters of the Rani and the Rawal. British Government sided with Rawal's supporters and sent an urgent requisition for a detachment of British troops from Nasirabad cantonment.¹⁰⁸ Meanwhile, a battalion of Nagas posted at Hinddaun left its post without any order and joined the mutineers in the City. Col. Rapper was worried about the personal safety of the Rawal and asked Rani "to allow him and his people to come out of the

104. Trans. of letter dated 2nd May, 1819, from Bhatianee Rani to Ochterlony, *op. cit.*, NAI.

105. Letter dated 1st October, 1820, from Ochterlony to Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 28th October, 1820, No. 20, P.C., NAI.

106. Proclamation dated 19th August, 1821, F. & P. Deptt. dated 22nd September, 1821, No. 7, P.C. NAI.

107. Letter dated 9th October, 1824, from Rapper, Resident at Jaipur to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., dated 12th November, 1824, No. 10, P.C. NAI.

108. Letter dated 9th October, 1824, from Rapper to Brigd. Knox, F. & P. Deptt., dated 12th November, 1824, No. 10, P.C. NAI.

City.”¹⁰⁹ The Queen mother agreed to it but refused to recognise Rawal as Mukhtiar.¹¹⁰ In the circumstances, Ochterlony reached Jaipur on 29th November, 1824, for settlement. He agreed with the removal of Berisal and gave his sanction for the appointment of Thakur Megh Singh of Diggi as Mukhtiar and Missar Ganesh Narain and Govind Narain as the Chief Revenue officers.¹¹¹ This arrangement composed the differences between the Rani and British authorities.

Interference in Kota

In Kota, too, difficulties arose at the death of Maharao Umed Singh on 21st November, 1819. His successor Maharao Kishore Singh who was not on good terms with Madho Singh, the son of Zalim Singh, was not prepared to reconcile to the position of remaining as a titular Chief under Madho Singh. Col. Tod, the Political Agent, supported the Maharao's stand.¹¹²

On 6th and 7th April, Maharao's party called their men into the fort and prohibited the entrance to the Rajrana's men. The peace of Kota was, thus, threatened. Tod, therefore, allowed the Rajrana to bring in troops, which were ready. But even then, Tod refused to suggest any measure of coercion such as closing the water-gate of the fort or stopping provisions.¹¹³ But the British Government did not approve Col. Tod's compromising attitude on the plea that the Government had entered into the treaties with Zalim Singh and, therefore, Tod was instructed for an unqualified support to the Rajrana¹¹⁴ and to suppress any attempt which may subvert the authority of Rajrana.

109. Letter dated 11th October, 1824 from Rapper to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., dated 12th November, 1824, 14, P.C.

110. Letter dated 13th October, 1824, from Rani mother to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., dated 15th April, 1924, No. 18, P.C. NAI.

111. Letter dated 6th January, 1825, from Ochterlony to G. Swinton, F. & P. dated 15th April, 1825, No. 27, P.C. NAI.

112. Letter dated 12th March, 1820, from Colonel Tod to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 22nd April, 1820. No. 15, P.C. Para 70, NAI.

113. Letter dated 14th April, 1820, from Colonel Tod to Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 6th May, 1820, No. 24, P.C. NAI.

114. Letter dated 22nd April, 1820, from Metcalfe to Tod, F. & P. dated 22nd April, 1820, No. 20, P.C. NAI.

But in the meantime Tod succeeded in drawing up an engagement of 12 articles acceptable to both the Raoraja and the Rajrana. Maharao agreed to remain in nominal power and to remove Goverdhandas, the illegitimate son of Zalim Singh, to his Jagir.¹¹⁵ According to this agreement the Rajrana was allowed to post 200 of his men in the fort for his personal security, but on the day when the agreement was to be implemented more than 500 men secured access to the fort. Tod blamed Madho Singh for this deception and at the same time asked the Maharao to remove Goverdhandass. A time limit of 5 days was given¹¹⁶ to implement the demand. But the Maharao refused to accept the ultimatum. Though he agreed to dismiss Goverdhandass yet he desired to recall him at his own wishes.¹¹⁷ Tod, however, insisted that his demand be either accepted or rejected in toto.¹¹⁸ Ultimately the Maharao agreed to the departure of Goverdhandass who left Kota on 17th June.¹¹⁹ Maharao was not happy with this arrangement and so on 28th Dec., he crossed the Chambal and marched towards Bundi to meet Goverdhandass.¹²⁰ Being prepared Maharao entered Haroti with his rabble and Tod warned him of the consequences.¹²¹ Ultimately an engagement took place near Mangrol in which Prithvi Singh, the younger brother of Kishore Singh, was fatally wounded and the Maharao had to retire to Jaipur territory.

This conduct of the British Government alarmed the other

115. Letter dated 22nd May, 1820 from Tod to Metcalfe. F. & P. Deptt. dated 15th July, 1820, 16, P.C., NAI.

116. Letter dated 18th May, 1820, from Tod to Maharao, p. 61, list 1, p. 44, Serial No. 1, R.A.R., NAI.

117. Letter dated 1st June, 1820, from Maharao to Tod, p. 73, List No. 1, p. 44; Serial No. 1, R.A.R., NAI.

118. Letter dated 1st June, 1820, from Tod to Maharao, p. 77, List No. 1, p. 44, Serial No. 1, R.A.R., NAI.

119. Letter dated 17th June, 1820, from Tod to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 22nd July, 1820, No. 10, P.C., NAI.

120. Letter dated 26th December, 1820, from Zalim Singh to Tod, p. 305, List No. 1, p. 47, Serial No. 62, R.A.R., NAI.

121. Letter dated 18th August, 1821, from Tod to Swinton, F. & P. dated 22nd September, 1821, No. 15, P.C., NAI.

Rajput Princes and they wrote sympathetic letters¹²² to the Maharao. This created suspicion among the Rajput Princes about the British motive in making a minister more powerful than the Prince. The British Government, therefore, circulated a letter clarifying its own stand.¹²³

After some time Maharao reached Nathdwara and on 12th Nov., Tod's wakil placed before him a draft of the formal decision of the British Government. Maharao signed over the agreement on 18th Nov. 1821 which was a complete submission to the British Government.¹²⁴

The disturbances in Kota were the reactions to the British policies. The idea that the Regent alone was considered as the head of Kota State, and the Raja to be deemed as a titular head was against the positive usages of the Rajput States. Moreover, the waiving of the policy of non-interference created an inconsistency in the British policy towards Rajputana and produced consequences that shook the confidence of the people of Kota.

Interference in Alwar

The major case of political interference in Rajasthan is provided by Alwar during the period of our study. There has been no incident of note up to 1814 but with the death of Rao Raja Bakhtawar Singh in 1815, the situation became serious on the issue of succession. There were two claimants to the throne of the deceased Raja. The first was his illegitimate son Balwant Singh, from a Muslim concubine who had adopted Hinduism. The other was his nephew Beni Singh. The Rao Raja evidently wished for his son's succession and repeatedly sought for him some mark of acknowledgement from the Bri-

122. Letter dated 20th October, 1821, from Colonel Tod to Swinton, F. & P. 10th November, 1821, No. 13, P.C. NAI.

123. Letter dated 31st October, 1821 from Swinton to Ochterlony, F. & P. 31st October, 1821, No. 27, P.C. NAI.

124. Letter dated 16th December, 1821 from Ochterlony to Tod, F. & P. Deptt., dated 3rd January, 1822, No. 12, P.C. NAI.

tish Government.¹²⁵ After the Rao's death his friend Ahmed Baksh Khan of Ferozpur (Jhirka) to whose guardianship he had recommended his affairs, produced a paper in which it was said, "you will guard my honour, State and my son Balwant Singh and daughter and dismiss such officers as may oppose Balwant Singh."¹²⁶ The British Government, therefore, raised no objection to his professed guardianship.

But the chiefs and the officers of the State objected to the accession of Balwant Singh on account of his illegitimacy.¹²⁷ Both the parties, however, reached a compromise, according to which Beni Singh was acknowledged as the nominal Maharaja and Head of the State while Balwant Singh was to enjoy the whole executive power.¹²⁸ But the British Government kept reserved the "right of future interference should circumstances demanded it."¹²⁹

In June, 1825, an attempt was made to assassinate Nawab Ahmed Bux Khan, while he visited Delhi.¹³⁰ The assassin after arrest confessed to have been employed by Mulha, son of Ramoo Khawas, Chief Officer of Alwar State and the leader of Beni Singh's party. Ochterlony ordered the confinement of all the suspects pending an enquiry.¹³¹ This incident increased the tension between Balwant Singh and Beni Singh's parties. To avoid

125. Letter dated 30th January, 1815 from Metcalfe to Adam, F. & P. dated 28th February, 1815, No. 47, P.C., NAI.

126. Engagement of Bakhtawar Singh, Rao Raja of Alwar, enclosed with letter dated 29th June, 1824, from Ochterlony to Swinton, F. & P. Deptt., dated 23rd July, 1824, No. 8, P.C., NAI.

127. Declaration of Alwar Officers enclosed with letter dated 29th June, 1824, from Ochterlony to G. Swinton, F. & P. Deptt., dated 23rd July, 1824, No. 8, P.C., NAI.

128. Letter dated 4th April, 1815, from Metcalfe to Adam, F. & P. dated 2nd May, 1815, No. 18, P.C., NAI.

129. Letter dated 12th April, 1815, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dated 2nd May, 1815, No. 19, P.C., NAI.

130. Letter dated 25th June, 1824, from Ochterlony to Swinton, F. & P. Deptt., dated 23rd July, 1824, No. 7, P.C., NAI.

131. Letter dated 1st July, 1824, from Ochterlony to Swinton, F. & P. Deptt., dated 23rd July, 1824, No. 10, P.C., NAI.

their direct clash Ochterlony recommended the following settlement:—¹³²

1. Treasure to be equally divided between Beni Singh and Balwant Singh.
2. The Parghanas roughly of the value of those bestowed by the British Government, i.e., four lakhs, to be assigned to Balwant Singh and his heirs.
3. In case of failure of heirs the assignment to revert to Alwar State.
4. It was further declared that "whilst any suspicion remained of Beni Singh being at the bottom of the assassination plot, it was peculiarly undesirable to make an exclusive declaration in his favour."¹³³

On the lines of the suggestion made, the agreement was conducted. Accordingly, Balwant Singh received half of the assignment in land and half in money. His power was recognised¹³⁴ over Parganas worth rupees two lakhs. The suspected persons were acquitted on account of lack of evidence.

Interference in Bharatpur

The gaddi of Bharatpur became a bone of contention after the death of Maharaja Baldeo Singh on 26th Feb., 1825. There were two claimants to the throne, one Balwant Singh son of Baldeo Singh, and the other Durjansal. In ordinary course Ochterlony had granted the *Khilat* to Maharaja's son Balwant Singh on 6th Feb., 1825, and accordingly Balwant Singh was immediately installed.¹³⁵

Revolt of Durjansal: The British Attitude

But, Durjansal, another claimant, was being supported by

132. Letter dated 14th July, 1824 from Ochterlony to Thakur Akhay Singh and Balmukund, F. P. Deptt., dated 5th April, 1825, No. 4, P.C. NAI.

133. Letter dated 5th April, 1825, from G. Swinton to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 5th April, 1825, No. 35, P.C. NAI.

134. Letter dated 21st February, 1826 from Metcalfe to G. Swinton, F. & P. dated 14th April, 1826, No. 20, P.C. NAI.

135. Letter dated 2nd March, 1825, Baijnath, Bharatpur Vakil to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 1st October, 1824; No. 4, P.C. NAI.

most of the Jat community. He attacked the fort on 13th March, 1825,¹³⁶ and gained control of the fort as well as of the Raja. Ochterlony declared this action as a 'cold blooded step' and announced his decision to oppose the usurpation.¹³⁷ He appealed that 'every Jat, great or small, should oppose and expel Durjansal', and promised that soon the British forces will come to assist the rightful claimant¹³⁸ and simultaneously started military preparations.

But in the meantime the Governor-General in Council declared that British Government would not support the claim of Balwant Singh in the event of dispute, as the succession was internal question and is not covered under the treaty. Ochterlony was, therefore, called upon to stop the advance of troops and all other actions in support of Balwant Singh.¹³⁹ Meanwhile, Madho Singh, the younger brother of Durjansal tried to capture the power and make a possession of Deeg fort.¹⁴⁰ He tried to obtain the British support in ousting Durjansal and to give his support to Balwant Singh provided 'Mookhtiarree' is given to him.¹⁴¹ But when Metcalfe was appointed Resident at Delhi and the Agent to the Governor-General for the States of Rajputana, he held that the British Government was duty bound, by virtue of its position as a paramount power in India, to impose its will on the States in subordinate alliance in order to maintain general peace and lawful succession.¹⁴² He declared that the use of force was essential to maintain the succession of

136. Letter dated 14th March, 1825, Macsween, Magistrate of Agra, to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., 15th April, 1825, No. 7, P.C. NAI.

137. Letter dated 16th March, 1825, from Ochterlony to Swinton, F. & P. dated 15th April, 1825, No. 6, P.C. NAI.

138. Proclamation by D. Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., dated 5th April, 1825, No. 44, P.C. NAI.

139. Letter dated 3rd April, 1825, from Swinton to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 29th July, 1825, No. 11, P.C., NAI.

140. Letter dated 2nd July, 1825 from Macsween to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 29th July, 1825, No. 11, P.C. NAI.

141. Letter dated 1st July, 1825, from Baijnath to Ochterlony, F. & P. Deptt., dated 29th July, 1825, No. 14, P.C., NAI.

142. Memo. by C. T. Metcalfe dated 29th August, 1825, F. & P. Deptt., dated 16th September, 1825, No. 21, S.C. NAI.

Maharaja Balwant Singh to the throne¹⁴³ and, therefore, ordered the army to march on Bharatpur.

Bharatpur surrenders

The British army reached Bharatpur by 10th October, 1825 and British were surprised to see that "Durjansal retained exclusive power over the State and was supported by the people of his tribe."¹⁴⁴ Jats whether belonging to Bharatpur or British territories directly or indirectly helped Durjansal.¹⁴⁵ It had become a national cause for them. Durjansal received the complete obedience from people of all walks of life, irrespective of the army, the Chiefs and the people.¹⁴⁶ It was also believed that troops from Alwar, Jodhpur, Jaipur and Karauli were among the defenders though Metcalfe seriously doubted it.¹⁴⁷ To avoid British attack Durjansal offered to acknowledge Balwant Singh, but Metcalfe demanded his personal surrender unconditionally.¹⁴⁸ Ultimately battle broke out and a successful breach in the wall effected by mining, enabled the British troops to conquer the City. Durjansal was arrested and sent to Allahabad as a State prisoner.¹⁴⁹

Interference in Jodhpur

Not much time had elapsed since the conclusion of the treaty of 1818, than the British Government tried to interfere in the internal affairs of Jodhpur State. Just after the treaty

143. Letter dated 21st October, 1825, from Metcalfe to Swinton, F. & P. Deptt., dated 18th November, 1825. No. 5, P.C. NAI.

144. Letter dated 7th January, 1826 from Metcalfe to Swinton, F. & P. dated 10th February, 1826, No. 5, P.C. NAI.

145. British Government order dated 4th December, 1825, of confiscating the property of those helping Durjansal. F. & P. dated 30th December, 1825, Nos. 10-11, P.C. NAI.

146. Letter dated 16th January, 1826, from Metcalfe to Swinton, F. & P. dated 10th February, 1826, No. 5, P.C. NAI.

147. Letter dated 16th January 1826, from Metcalfe to Swinton, *op. cit.*, NAI.

148. Correspondence between Bharatpur Agents and Metcalfe, F. & P. Deptt., dated 10th February, 1826, Nos. 4-10, P.C., NAI.

149. *Ibid.*

was signed it was popularly believed that Maharaja Man Singh had become mentally deranged.¹⁵⁰ In Oct. 1818, Maharaja Man Singh made a requisition for two battalions and expressed his willingness to pay their expenses.¹⁵¹ He also expressed his desire that these troops would act under his own orders in suppressing the disobedient Thakurs. Ochterlony was all along in favour of British interference but he considered it necessary that a true picture of the State should be obtained and therefore deputed his Head Munshi, Burkat Ali, to Jodhpur.¹⁵² Meanwhile, the internal situation of the State had gone from bad to worse, Maharaja's rival, Fateh Raj, mobilised his forces and captured the city and the Maharaja and his ministers remained in the possession of the fort only.

This was the state of affairs when Burkat Ali reached Jodhpur. Burkat Ali found that all rumours about the Maharaja's insanity were incorrect and the Maharaja had more sense "than hundreds of his people." Burkat Ali conveyed to the Maharaja the Resident's willingness to help him in re-establishing his authority.¹⁵³ This created a suspicion in the Maharaja's mind and he could guess that under the name of friendly assistance, British desired the liberty of interfering in the internal affairs of the State. Therefore Maharaja made a capital out of the presence of Burkat Ali by showing that British Government regarded him as the Head of the State, and as such the other Chiefs and Thakurs also expressed their loyalty to the Maharaja.

Deputation of European Officers

On the report of Burkat Ali, the British Government in order to know the actual state of affairs favoured the deputation of some of the Europeans to Jodhpur and accordingly

150. Letter dated 12th August, 1818, from Ochterlony to Adam, F. & P. dated 5th September, 1818, No. 16, S.C. NAI.

151. Letter dated Nil from Maharaja of Jodhpur to Ochterlony, F. & P. dated 7th November, 1818, No. 34, S.C. NAI.

152. Letter dated 13th October, 1818, from Ochterlony to Adam, F. & P. dated 7th November, 1818, No. 33, S.C., NAI.

153. Report of Syed Burkat Ali, F. & P. dt. 26th Dec., 1818, No. 56, P.C. NAI.

But Dhonkal Singh entered into Jodhpur territory and captured Deedwana.¹⁶⁵ Maharaja Man Singh requested for the British assistance. The Political Agent was, however, directed not to promise anything unless the Maharaja was prepared to submit his differences with his nobles to British arbitration.¹⁶⁶ After all when Dhonkal Singh reached up to Merta, the Maharana agreed to British arbitration¹⁶⁷ and consequently to a modification of the agreement of 1824. With the result, Dhonkal Singh then quitted the Jodhpur territory and disbanded his forces according to the wishes of Cavandish.¹⁶⁸

British interference in Bikaner

The general rebellion on the part of the nobility had driven the Bikaner Maharaja into alliance with the British Government. Accordingly, immediately after the conclusion of the treaty of 1818 the Maharaja made a requisition for a British force against his rebellious Chiefs. The British too were anxious to re-establish the Maharaja's authority so that a trade route through Bikaner and Bhawalpur could be opened safely.¹⁶⁹ Resident, therefore, called a force and the contingent of horse detached under it. Lt. Low gained possession of Neema, Nahan, Satun and Baharod in the Bikaner territory.¹⁷⁰ Meanwhile there was an outbreak of Bhatias at Fatehabad and Sirsa. The British Government considered it the most suitable opportunity for settling the frontier effectively and fulfilling its obligations towards the Maharaja of Bikaner by establishing his authority which had been "set at defiance by predatory bands encouraged and sup-

165. Letter dt. Nil from G.R. Clerk to Delhi Resident, F. & P. dt. 29th July, 1828, No. 11, P.C. NAI.

166. Letter dt. 29th June, 1828 from Delhi Resident to A. Sterling, F. & P. dt. 29th June, 1828, No. 13, P.C. NAI.

167. Letter dt. 21st July, 1828 from R. Cavandish to Delhi Resident, F. & P. dt. 16th Aug., 1828, No. 20, P.C. NAI.

168. Letter dt. 1st Aug., 1828, from Cavandish to Delhi Resident, F. & P. dt. 29th Aug., 1828, No. 15, P.C. NAI.

169. Letter dt. 19th Feb., 1817 from Metcalfe to Adam, F. & P. dt. 15th March, 1817, No. 19, P.C. NAI.

170. Letter dt. 5th April, 1818 from Metcalfe to Adam, F. & P. dt. 1st May, 1818, No. 63, P.C. NAI.

ported by feudatories of that State." The British force, therefore, after the recovery of Fatehabad and Sirsa was ordered to march into Bikaner territory for the purpose.¹⁷¹

The places Brigd. Arnold was required to reduce were Dadreva, Sidmukh, Sirsila, Churu, Zahireva, Suluknea and Gundeli.¹⁷² A small force of the Maharaja also joined the operation but a very strong resistance was offered. Thakur Prithvi Singh evacuated the fort without resistance and his uncle went to Bikaner to beg forgiveness on behalf of the whole family. The Sidmukh's surrender broke the morale and almost all the rebel Chiefs surrendered before the British force one after another. Surajmal of Dadreva evacuated his fort and took up his residence in Shekhawati.¹⁷³ Similarly other Thakurs, the Thakurs of Gandeli, Zahireva, Sirsila and Churu, also surrendered and the forts were occupied by the British detachment.¹⁷⁴ All these actions resulted in restoring a complete peace in the Bikaner territory.

British policy after 1825

The incidents of Kota, Jaipur, Mewar, Alwar, Bharatpur, and Jodhpur had involved the British Government in to lots of responsibilities. In fact, the British interference in the States, as we have seen, led to the unrest and anarchy in the States instead of establishing peace and tranquillity. In fact, such a situation was never contemplated by C. T. Metcalfe when he established British connection with the Rajput States in 1818. The year 1825, therefore, witnessed a great change in British attitude towards the native States with the appointment of

171. Letter dt. 14th Aug., 1818, from Adam to Metcalfe, F. & P. dt. 14th Aug., 1818, No. 72, P.C. NAI.

172. Letter dt. 23rd Aug., 1818, from Metcalfe to Brigd. Arnold, F. & P. dt. 26th Sept., 1818, No. 50, P.C. NAI.

173. Letter dt. 2nd Sept., 1818, from Brigd. Arnold to Col. Nicol, Adgt. Gen., H.Q. F. & P. dt. 26th Sept., 1818, No. 50, P.C. NAI.

174. Letter dt. 3rd Sept., 1818 from Arnold to Metcalfe, F. & P. dt. 17th Oct., 1818, No. 62, P.C.

175. Letter dt. 3rd Sept., 1818 from Arnold to Metcalfe, F. & P. dt. 17th Oct., 1818, No. 64, P.C. NAI.

Lord C. T. Metcalfe as the Resident at Delhi and Agent to the Governor-General for the States of Rajputana. Explaining the policy of non-interference Metcalfe said, "in case of misrule endangering the peace of the country or extremely harmful to the interests of the State, the deposition of culpable regency and the nomination of the another according to the customs of the State, with full powers, would be preferable to the appointment of a minister with our support under the Regency; for this latter arrangement can hardly fail to produce, either a divided or an inefficient Government (as in Jaipur), or an odious usurpation (as in Hyderabad)."¹⁷⁶ Therefore, soon after the settlement of Bharatpur affair, Metcalfe turned to implement these ideas in the States of Rajasthan particularly in Jaipur and Mewar, where the British Government had interfered most extensively.

Jaipur (1825 onwards)

Metcalfe's attention was drawn towards the problem of the disputes of Shekhawati and of Uniara, a tributary of Jaipur. In the former case the dispute was with regard to the surrender of district Khandela of Sikar to Jaipur Government and in the latter case the Maharaja of Jaipur desired to make some changes in the administration of Uniara. Therefore, when complaints were made by the dissatisfied chiefs to Metcalfe, he strictly forbade such interference in the internal affairs of the State.¹⁷⁷ These incidents though were not of a great importance, but they were a pointer to the policy that the new Resident was going to follow. Similar attitude was adopted, when Rawal Berisal complained that the village of Anandpur previously granted to his son by the Regent Rani had now been confiscated by her. Though Rapper, the Political Agent at Jaipur, wanted to use the influence of the British Government in this case,¹⁷⁸ but Metcalfe disallowed the petition of the Rawal declaring the sub-

176. Memo. by C.T. Metcalfe, dt. 29th Aug., 1825, Deptt., dt. 16th Sept., 1825, No. 21, S.C. NAI.

177. Letter dt. 12th Nov., 1825 from Metcalfe to Rapper, F. & P. dt. 17th Feb., 1826, No. 11, P.C. NAI.

178. Letter dt. 7th Nov., 1825 from Rapper to Metcalfe, F. & P. dt. 17th Feb., 1826, No. 11, P.C. NAI.

and the political relations of Jaipur State were transferred to the Supdt. of Ajmer.¹⁸⁶

Mewar (1825 onwards)

On 12th Nov., 1826, Capt. Cobbe went on leave and Capt. Sutherland took over as the Acting Political Agent in Mewar. Sutherland was a close friend of Metcalfe and thus adopted his views on the policy of 'non-interference'. It was in accordance with this policy that Sutherland abolished the system of deploying badged servants, holding securities for the tribute and control over the customs.¹⁸⁷

Accordingly, during his visit to Udaipur, Metcalfe met Maharana Bheem Singh on 13th Dec., 1826, and accepted the ten requests¹⁸⁸ of the Maharana in order to strengthen Maharana's authority over the State, subjects, and servants. In accepting the demands of the Maharana the policy of Metcalfe was to minimise the interference of the political Agent to the minimum. In spite of the opposition of Cobbe,¹⁸⁹ Metcalfe took another step towards the policy of non-interference by ordering the withdrawal of a party of British cavalry men employed at Hamirgarh to secure roads. He declared that the patrolling of the trade routes in the State was to be the duty and privilege of the Maharana himself¹⁹⁰ and the Governor-General approved Metcalfe's proposals.¹⁹¹

Thus, with the restoration of Prince's authority, it was decided to close the Political Agency in Mewar also in 1830 and

186. Resolution of the Supreme Govt., dt. 14th Oct., 1830, F. & P. dt. 14th Oct., 1830, No. 1, P.C. NAI.

187. Letter dt. 1st Dec., 1826, from Sutherland to Metcalfe, F. & P. depts., dt. 20th Jan., 1827, No 47, P.C. NAI.

188. Letter dt. 29th Dec., 1826 from Metcalfe to Stirling. Dy. Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. dt. 2nd Feb., 1827, No. 22, P.C. NAI.

189. Letter dt. 6th Jan., 1827 from Cobbe to Metcalfe, F. & P. depts., dt. 9th Feb., 1827, No. 16, P.C. NAI.

190. Letter dt. 6th Jan., 1827 from Metcalfe to Cobbe, F. & P. depts., dt. 9th Feb., 1827, No. 16, P.C. NAI.

191. Letter dt. 17th Feb., 1827 from Stirling to Metcalfe, F. & P. depts., dt. 8th June, 1827, No. 40, P.C. NAI.

the Supdt. of Ajmer was entrusted with the conduct of the affairs of Mewar.

Bikaner (1825 onwards)

Metcalf's Policy of non-interference was applied to Bikaner when in 1830, Berisal, a powerful Chief, rebelled against the authority of the Maharaja of Bikaner. The Resident had agreed with the Maharaja to send British troops to suppress the rebellious Thakur and had instructed "the commanding officer of the Rajputana Field Force to hold the Regiments of Native Infantry and an adequate proportion of Horse Artillery in readiness to march into Bikaner territory." But Metcalfe opposed the Resident's view and argued that the 6th and 7th articles of the treaty was wholly of a temporary nature. He, therefore, directed the Resident to stop the march of troops into Bikaner.¹

Bentinck's Policy

Metcalf's experiment in non-interference provided a refreshing contrast to the former policies and was able to restore confidence at least in two premier States of Rajasthan, viz., Jaipur and Udaipur and still reserve to the British Government a sovereign paternal jurisdiction which was not likely to be resented. Metcalfe, in fact, was eager to regulate the relations of the British Government with the Indian States on a principle that would avoid vexatious interference in the internal affairs of the State on the part of the Paramount power yet would reserve to it, superior rights of stewardship and superintendence.

But with Lord William Bentinck a new attitude was taken, though Bentinck also supported the Metcalfe's Policy of non-interference. In fact the Bentinck's policy can be called a policy of 'convenience' as envisaged by the incidents that took

192. Letter dt. 5th Oct., 1830, from F. Hawkins to Commanding Officer, Rajputana Field Force, F. & P. dt. 22nd Oct., 1830, No. 36, P.C. NAI.

193. Minutes of Metcalfe, dt. 22nd Oct., 1830, F. & P. depts. dt. 22nd Oct., 1830, No. 37, P.C. NAI.

place particularly in Jodhpur and Bikaner. Actually in those affairs, which concerned the rights of the British Government or those which came in its purview as the paramount power and which affected the general peace of the country, Bentinck applied stricter control than his predecessors. In these affairs he took measures to vindicate the power of the paramount authority of the British Government. Thus the policy pursued by Bentinck towards the States of Rajputana clearly showed that he was never restrained by the policy of non-interference.

Bentinck invited Princes of Rajputana at Ajmer

By 1831, the Britishers had begun to feel that it was their responsibility that the native States did not attack on the neighbouring States and the law and order situation was maintained. The prevalence of the system of plundering raids of the subjects of one State on another, and their attack on the innocent merchants and travellers attracted¹⁹¹ the attention of William Bentinck in 1831. Lt. Col. A. Lockett, the Political Agent at Bharatpur, was deputed by William Bentinck for collecting the necessary information about the plundering bands and their activities in the most disturbed tract of Shekhawati (Jaipur).¹⁹² Bentinck was also eager to take steps in co-operation with the Bombay Presidency for establishing a permanent peace on the common frontiers at Kutch (in Bombay Presidency), Sind, and Malani (in Jodhpur State) which were very much disturbed by the activities of armed Khosa plunders of Parkar.¹⁹³ But Bentinck was of the view that rulers of Rajputana ought to be consulted before any decision was taken with regard to the prevention of the said armed activities. In pursuance of this policy

191. Letter dt. 10th Oct., 1831 from Prinsep to Martin, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 4th Nov., 1831, No. 9, NAI.

192. Letter dt. 13th March, from Prinsep to Martin, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 2nd April, 1831, No. 44, NAI.

193. Letter dt. 25th August, 1831 from Bentinck to Lord Clare, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 7th Oct., 1831, Secret, No. 16, NAI., Letter dt. 24th Oct., 1831 from Prinsep to Martin, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 18th Nov., 1831, No. 21, NAI.

he invited the native Princes of Ajmer to attend a Darbar for a personal discussion over the problem of law and order.¹⁹⁷

The Ajmer Darbar (1832)

Bentinck reached Ajmer on Jan. 18, 1832.¹⁹⁸ The native chiefs who assembled in Ajmer to meet Bentinck were Nawab Amir Khan of Tonk, Maharana Jawan Singh of Mewar, Maharaja Jai Singh of Jaipur, Maharao Ram Singh of Kota, Maharaja Kalyan Singh of Kishangarh, and Maharao Ram Singh of Bundi. As the territories of Bikaner and Jaisalmer were quite far from Ajmer, their ruling chiefs were not invited.¹⁹⁹ But, however, both the principalities had sent their vakils to represent them. The Regent of Sirohi, Rao Shiva Singh was also not invited,²⁰⁰ though he was represented by his wakil.²⁰¹ Maharaja Man Singh of Jodhpur could not do so due to the unrest among his troops at that time.²⁰²

On this occasion the rulers requested the British Government to help them against the undesirable activities of the robbers and the neighbouring chiefs. The Maharaja of Jaipur requested the British Government to help the State by way of military aid to suppress the robberies in the Shekhawati tract, which were creating a lot of difficulties for the merchants and travellers.²⁰³ The Maharana of Mewar also demanded military

197. Letter dt. 15th Dec., 1831 from Prinsep to Martin, F. & P. Deput., dt. 2nd April, 1832, No. 15, NAI.

198. Fraser, J. Baillie. *The Military Memoirs of Lt. Col. James Skinner*, Vol. II, p. 218, Quoted by H.B. Sarda: *Ajmer Historical and Descriptive*, p. 209.

199. Kharita, dt. 9th Jany. 1832 from Governor-General to the Maharaja of Bikaner, F. & P. Deput., dt. 2nd April, 1832, No. 2, NAI.

200. Kharita from Rao Shiva Singh of Sirohi to Governor-General, F. & P. Deput., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 38, NAI.

201. Kharita from Rao Shiva Singh of Sirohi to Governor-General, *op. cit.*, NAI.

202. Kharita from Maharaja Man Singh of Jodhpur to Bentinck received on 16th April, F. & P. Deput., dt. 7th May, 1832, No. 32, NAI.

203. Request of Jaipur State dt. Nil, F. & P. Deput., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 5, NAI.

help to maintain peace in Mewar Hill tract.²⁰⁴ But the Governor-General did not accede with the rulers' demand as it could not be made available to deal with the internal affairs of the State.²⁰⁵

The Bikaner wakil complained about the incursions into the State territory by the Shekhawats of Jaipur and Jodhpur and by the subjects of Jaisalmer.²⁰⁶ He even held that the Maharawal of Jaisalmer was responsible for instigating his people to create unrest in the territory of Bikaner and therefore requested the Governor-General to use his influence on the Maharawal to refrain from his evil pursuit.²⁰⁷

The Jaisalmer wakil complained about the plundering raids allegedly organised by the Maharaja of Bikaner and requested the Governor-General to take adequate steps to stop them. He accused the Maharaja of Bikaner having a personal grudge against the Maharawal of Jaisalmer.²⁰⁸ Similarly the Sirohi wakil complained that Udaipur and Jodhpur had instigated the Bhils and Minas of Sirohi to join against the State.²⁰⁹ The wakil, therefore, requested the Governor-General to take necessary measures to stop such unlawful activities.²¹⁰

Bentinck after receiving complaints reached to the conclusion that "British Government had been able to exterminate the organised predatory hordes of the Pindaris in Rajputana, the border feuds and plunderings on perhaps, as numerous and expensive as ever in this region."²¹¹

204. Request of the Maharana to Governor-General (No. 2), dt. 7th Feb., 1832, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 3rd Dec., 1832, No. 26, NAI.

205. Request of Jaipur State, dt. Nil, *op. cit.*, NAI.

206. Statement of the aggressions of Jodhpur and Jaipur subjects on Bikaner, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 6, NAI.

207. Statement of disputes between Bikaner and Jaisalmer, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 6, NAI.

208. Arzi from Juniyat Rao, Wakil of Jaisalmer, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 13, NAI.

209. Translation of a representation from the State of Sirohi, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 38, NAI.

210. Translation of a representation from the State of Sirohi, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 9th July, 1832, No. 38, NAI.

211. Bentinck's minute dt. 30th March, 1832, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 16th April, 1832, No. 22, NAI.

British interference in Jodhpur and Jodhpur's attitude

In spite of the decision arrived at Ajmer in 1832, Maharaja of Jodhpur believed not to apprehend the thugs or to assist in securing them. In June, 1833, therefore, the G.G. addressed the Maharaja a letter, "couched in terms of mild remonstrance and warning him of the line of conduct being pursued by him." No reply to this communication was received for one year. The absence of a speedy and satisfactory answer was taken to mean that the Maharaja had no desire to "possess the good opinion of the Supreme Government."²¹² The British Government feared that the Maharaja's conduct, if followed by other Chiefs, was bound to adversely affect the political system of India.²¹³ On account of all this the British required Maharaja Jodhpur to pay compensation for the aggressions on neighbouring States and for the robbery committed by her subjects in the house of Dr. Motley. The British Government was prepared to back her demands by force. Accordingly, orders were issued in August, 1834, for the assemblage of a force under Brigd. Stevenson and in case Maharaja Man Singh offered resistance, he was to be deposed and Dhonkal Singh was to succeed.²¹⁴ The additional demands were also placed by the British Government according to which the Maharaja was to be required to defray all the armament expenses and was to pay for the support of the body of 1,000 horse in lieu of a contingent of 1,500 horse which he was required to furnish when asked by the stipulation of the 8th article of the treaty.

Maharaja Man Singh deputed a wakil and sent a mission to Ajmer in 1834 under Anoop Ram Vyas, but with no results. Ultimately the mission had to submit to all the British demands²¹⁵ and the Maharaja expressed "regret at the unusual de-

212. Letter dt. 15th May, 1834 from Trevelyan to Major Alves, *op. cit.*, NAI.

213. Letter dt. 15th May, 1834 from Trevelyan to Major Alves, *op. cit.*, NAI.

214. Letter dt. 22nd Aug., 1834, from W.H. Macnaghten to Major N. Alves, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 26th June, 1834, No. 59, P.C. NAI.

215. Letter dt. 7th Oct., 1834 from Alves to Macnaghten, F. & P. dt. 2nd Dec., 1834, No. 23, P.C. NAI.

lay in reply to his letter and beg to forgive his past conduct."²¹⁶ But the Governor-General in Council was still not fully satisfied. Major Alves was, therefore, directed to sequesterate the Jodhpur's share of Sambhur Salt works till the State's fulfilment of all the conditions.²¹⁷ The Maharaja resisted but without success. In 1835, Trevelyan visited Jodhpur and during his visit the Maharaja agreed to pay Rs. one lakh and 15 thousand annually and assured Trevelyan his full co-operation regarding the arrest of thugs.²¹⁸

British use of force in Jodhpur

About this time Maharaja Man Singh was under the great influence of Naths and the British Government was determined to put an end of Nath's influence not only because they had caused a lot of mal-administration and persecuted a large portion of the nobility but also because they had attempted to drag Jodhpur into a league with foreign powers.²¹⁹ It was rumoured that Russia and Persia were contemplating a joint attack on India and it was believed by the British that, finding it an opportune moment, a league of Indian Princes with Man Singh at its head had been formed. These were the reasons which prompted the British to end the Nath's Supremacy in Jodhpur.²²⁰

Accordingly a light detachment under Brigd. Rich crossed the Jodhpur border on 2nd August, 1839. Ultimately Maharaja Man Singh had to accept all the British demands and vacate the fort on 27th Sept., 1839.

216. Maharaja Man Singh to Governor General F. & P. dt. 2nd Dec., 1834, No. 28, P.C. NAI.

217. Letter dt. 2nd Dec., 1834, from Macnaghten to Alves, F. & P. dt. 11th Feb., 1835, No. 35, P.C. NAI.

218. Letter dt. 23rd Oct., 1835, from Alves to Managhten, F. & P. dt. 16th Nov., 1835, No. 30, P.C. NAI.

219. Letter dt. 20th April, 1839 from J. Sutherland to Willoughby, Secy., Bombay Government, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 22nd May, 1839, No. 56, S.C. NAI.

220. Letter dt. 10th June, 1839 from J. Sutherland to T.H. Maddock, F. & P. dt. 24th July, 1839, No. 39, S.C. NAI.

Similar interference is also discernible in Jaipur. In 1834, the British authorities at Delhi reported numerous cases of murder and plunder committed by the inhabitants of Jaipur. The A.G.G. in Rajputana, on non-obtaining any response from the States, recommended the direct interference in Shekhawati for the restoration of peace, law and order.²²¹ Accordingly a British force under Maj. Alves marched into Jaipur-Shekhawati. The conditions remained normal till the appearance of a band of Shekhawati plunderers headed by Dungar Singh alias Doongji.²²² Being dissatisfied with the provision made for their support, they had recourse to plundering. They had been sentenced to transportation for life by a court of vakils in Oct., 1845, and were put in Agra Jail, from where they were rescued and subsequently looted Nasirabad pay office. The British authorities were incensed at this daring inroad into British territory and requested the native States to co-operate in the seizure of these freebooters. Later on Doongji was captured by the Jodhpur troops and was handed over to the Jodhpur Government where he remained under confinement till his death.

Policy of Lord Dalhousie and the Princes of Rajasthan

In the long pursuit of the policy of involvement, non-interference and convenience, Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation marks a new stage in the history of the relations of British and Indian States. His policy of annexation had created suspicion among the Indian Princes with regard to the British objectives.²²³ For instance on 10th July, 1852, when Maharaja Nar Singh Pal of Karauli died, the Governor-General proposed the merger of the State with the British Dominion. But the Court of Direc-

221. Letter dt. 23rd Aug., 1839 from J. Sutherland to Maddock, F. & P. dt. Nov., 1839, No. 43 S.C. NAI.

222. Letter dt. 25th April, 1834, from Alex Spiers, Offg. A.G.G. to W.H. Macnaghten, Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., dt. 12th June, 1834, No. 116, P.C. NAI.

223. Grithard, Commissioner of Kanpur, wrote to the Lt. Governor Colvin in Feb., 1857 that the people of Rajasthan were greatly agitated over the British policy of annexation of the States. Kaye, J.W., *A History of Sepoy War in India*, Part I, p. 484.

tors did not accede to his demand. However, the claim of the adopted son, Bharatpal, was not accepted by the British Government and Madan Pal was recognised as ruler of Karauli.²²¹ This aroused the feelings of suspicion among Indian Princes and their suspicion led them to believe that the Princes were being reduced to the position of mere puppets in the hands of Britishers.

General observations

The inroads of the Marathas continued to make in the Rajputana States and instinct of self-preservation were mainly responsible for dragging the Princes of Rajasthan within the expanding folds of British imperialism. But as the British Policy was shifting from 'Protection' to 'non-intervention' and 'non-intervention' to 'co-operation' and 'convenience' it gave opportunities to the Princes also to adopt a wait-and-see attitude in regard to the power and authority of British rule in India.

Another important factor which determined Rajput attitude towards the British should not be lost sight of. The insistence on legal rights to interfere in the internal affairs of the Rajputana States created a strong feeling among the Princes and high-placed persons of the States in many respects no doubt with ample justification that their privileges and time-honoured usages would seriously suffer if the British rule were to become effective and strong. With this kind of suspicion there appeared acts of disobedience against British authority under the leadership of Queen-mother of Jaipur and Jhot Ram in Jaipur. Maharaja Man Singh of Jodhpur showed hostile attitude more than once to defend his position. Similarly the vassals of these Princes revealed on several occasions inimical designs to British imperial interests.

Though the treaties dictated by the British and the policy followed thereof established peace in Rajputana, it gave birth to new problems. The Princes' entry into negotiations with the

224. *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Provincial Series, Rajputana, p. 355.

British was too much for the taste of the Thakurs. They regarded the new ties as an excessive compliance to British authorities. This is why when the mutiny broke out high-minded nobles took the side of the mutineers to express their anger and alarm towards British control.

The citizens of Rajasthan were also alive to these changes in a limited sense. The popular support in Bharatpur to Durjansal against British Power in 1825 and the widespread disturbance in Jaipur on the occasion of the arrival of Political Agent and subsequently the murder of English Officer during Maharaja Ram Singh's reign were open expressions of resentment against the offensive interference of the British.

These feelings of the princes, their vassals and the people bore the seed of awakening in Rajasthan.

CHAPTER II

MUTINY AND RAJASTHAN—1857

Thus the chaotic conditions in Rajasthan in the beginning of the 19th century constrained the Rajput States to seek or accept British protection. Almost all States entered into the treaties of subordinate alliance¹ with the East India Co. But despite treaties they quarrelled incessantly over petty affairs such as the observance of ceremonies, privileges, etc. The protection the Rajputs received from the Company did not, in any appreciable manner, bring about internal harmony and external peace. Strangely enough, protection only whetted their appetite for disorder and the Company was hard put to maintain a semblance of peace and tranquillity.

Administrative and Military Control of Britain in Rajasthan on the eve of the Mutiny

When Rajasthan was facing internal differences between the rulers and their Chiefs, the administrative and military control of the British was not quite satisfactory. Rajasthan was, nominally, under the charge of Lt. Governor of North-West province, while the responsibility of maintaining peace and order was of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan. At the time of the revolt George St. Patrick Laurance was the A.G.G. in Rajasthan and was assisted in his work by the Political Agents posted in the various important States. Captain C. L. Showers was posted at Udaipur, Captain William Eden at Jaipur, Captain Monck Mason at Jodhpur, Major Burton at Kota and Major Nixon at

1. Aitchison: *Engagement, Treaties and Sanads*, Vol. III.

Bharatpur. There were four important military stations—Nasirabad and Neemuch, Deoli and Ajmer. Rajasthan was, at the commencement of the Mutiny, held by the British troops.² At Nasirabad were stationed No. 6 Native Horse Field Battery, the 15th and 30th Bengal Native Infantry, and the 1st Bombay Cavalry (Lancers). At Neemuch the 4th troop 1st Brigade Bengal Native Horse Artillery, a wing of the 1st Bengal Cavalry, the 72nd Bengal Infantry and 7th Infantry Gwalior Contingent. At Deoli the Kota contingent, at Beawar the Mhairwara Battalion, at Feringhura the Jodhpur Legion, at Kherwara the Mewar Bhil Corps and troops of the 1st Bengal Cavalry were stationed. Ajmer Magazine was garrisoned by a company of the 15th Bengal Native Infantry and a company of the Mhairwara Local Battalion posted in the city for duty at the gates. The escort of Jaipur Political Agent consisted of a company of the 30th Bengal Native Infantry under an European Officer of the Political Agent. Harauttee of detachment of the Kota contingent, of the Political Agent at Jodhpur of a detachment of the Jodhpur Legion, of the Political Agent, Mewar of a detachment of the Mewar Bhil Corps when absent from Neemuch. At the time of mutiny there was not a single European soldier in Rajasthan and this embarrassed the British position when the mutiny broke out in Rajasthan.

First Intelligence of the Meerut and Delhi out-breaks: Precautionary measures taken by A.G.G. in Rajasthan

The information regarding the out-break at Meerut and Delhi reached to Gen. Lawrance, A.G.G., in Rajasthan, on 19th May, 1857, when he was at his summer retreat at Abu. He immediately warned the concerned authorities suggesting precautionary measures. On 21st May, 1857, the A.G.G. made a requisition of the Brigade at Deesa, the nearest place where European troops were stationed, to be detached with all expedi-

2. Letter No. 781A of 1858, No. 117A dated 27th July, 1858 from A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secretary, G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-3147, F.C. dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

3. Report sent by A.G.G. to the Secretary, G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., No. 3147 F.C. dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

tion to Nasirabad.⁴ Simultaneously, the A.G.G. urged the Bombay Government to send up all available European troops returning from Persia via Gujarat and Rajputana to Agra.⁵ On 23rd May, 1857, a proclamation⁶ was issued by the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to all the Chiefs in Rajputana calling on them 'to preserve peace within their borders, to intercept rebel fugitives and to collect their followers on their frontiers'.

Active Co-operation of the Native Rulers with the British

In response to the A.G.G.'s Proclamation the native rulers extended the most friendly assurances and offers of aid. The Rao of Sirohi expressing a hope that the outbreak at Delhi will be soon put down offered every sort of assistance that may be in his power to give.⁷ With the hearty consent of the Maharaja of Jaipur, Captain Eden, the Political Agent marched with 5,000 troops of the Jaipur State towards the Mathura and Gurgaon Districts to maintain order and to assist in the re-establishment of the civil Government.⁸ The Maharaja of Alwar also sent a force of about 2,500 men to co-operate with Captain Nixon though the Alwar forces could not prove very useful. The Maharaja of Jodhpur also responded to the call and placed 2,000 Horse and Foot and 6 guns at the disposal of A.G.G.⁹ Maharana Sarup Singh of Mewar supported the British cause and issued a *ruqqa*¹⁰ in June, 1857, to the Chiefs of Daroo

4. Letter No. 445 of the 21st May, 1857, enclosed with letter No. 456, dated 21st May, 1857 from the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, F.C. dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

5. Letter No. 445 of the 21st May, 1857, from A.G.G. in Rajasthan to Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

6. A.G.G.'s proclamation to the States. Letter No. 462, dated 23rd May, 1857, addressed to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P., NAI.

7. Despatch to the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors, No. 81 dated 24th December, 1857, F. & P., NAI.

8. A.G.G.'s Report F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47 dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

9. A.G.G.'s Report, *op. cit.*, NAI.

10. *Rajputana Residency Records*, April, 1860, Nos. 556-60, NAI.

Bewal, Bangra, Sevalur, Benota, Surwanger and Ulthana of the Neemuch District to assist the British interests. The Maharana placed his most trustworthy troops at Captain C. L. Showers' (The Political Agent at Mewar) disposal, which was headed by one of his highest and trusted Chiefs, Bakht Singh, the Rao of Bedla. Earlier, orders under 'Khas-Ruqqa' were at the same time issued on 27th May, 1857, calling upon all his royal chiefs and district officers to 'afford every aid in British operations and obey Showers' orders as his own'. In October, 1857, the Maharana issued a 'Parvana' to Bhomia Chiefs of Ogna, Panarva, Jawas, Madri, Jhalod and Chani in the hilly district of Mewar directing them to adopt effective measures for the safety of the British party at Kharwara and Kotra and see that no disturbances take place in the hilly tracts.

Mutiny at Nasirabad

The first out-break which took place in Rajasthan was at Nasirabad¹¹ commenced at 4 p.m. on 28th May, 1857, by the Infantry and Artillery seizing the guns. The removal of the Companies became the main cause of distrust. Mysterious reports were circulated of bone dust being mixed up with *atta* sold in the bazar and of cartridges being composed of objectionable materials. On 27th May troops heard of an European force coming to Nasirabad from Deesa. This rumour set the spark and next day the situation was critical.¹² The first Regiment Bombay Lancers did not co-operate with the mutineers and obeyed the orders to charge the guns.¹³ However, the Light Company, the Granadier Company and the Flank Companies all refused to fire on the mutineers.¹⁴ The charge being without effect, Brigadier Mecan retired with all the Europeans under cover of the Lancers to Beawar, where Col. Penny, command-

11. *Rajputana Residency Records*, April, 1860, Nos. 556-60, NAI.

12. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secretary, G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, F.C. dated 27th July, 1858, NAI.

13. Prichard. *The Mutinies in Rajputana*, p. 21.

14. A.G.G.'s report, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, F.C. dated 27th July, 1858, NAI.

15. Prichard, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

ing that Corps, died on the road probably due to excitement and exhaustion. The two British Officers were killed and two wounded (Captain Spottiswoode and Cornet Newberry, killed; and Captain Hardy and Lt. Locke, wounded). Thus, Nasirabad went into the hands of the rebels. After destroying the cantonments the mutineers, on the next day, took the road to Delhi.

Pursuit of the mutineers by Marwar Troops

Lt. Walter, Asstt. Commissioner of Ajmer, accompanied by Lt. Heathcote, Asstt. Quarter Master-General and Ensign Hood 30th Native Infantry with 1,000 of the Marwar troops pursued the mutineers but with no success as the 'troops of Mewar and Marwar allowed the Nasirabad mutineers to pass unmolested through their territory'. It was suspected that they had sympathy with the rebels.¹⁶

Mutiny at Neemuch

The second out-break took place at Neemuch on 3rd June, 1857, which is about 150 miles south of Nasirabad. On 2nd June, Colonel Abbott administered to the Sepoys an oath of allegiance making them swear on the holy Koran and of the Ganges water and he himself swore on the Bible expressing his confidence in the faithful intentions of the sepoys. But, on 3rd June when information regarding the events of Nasirabad reached at Neemuch, their rage knew no bounds. On the night of 3rd June at 11 p.m. two guns were fired by the Artillery.¹⁷ The Cavalry immediately surrounded the station by the pickets and set fire to the cantonments. The mutineers set fire to all the bungalows along with the Brigade Major's house. At 4 a.m. a Naiek and 4 Sepoys, dressed, but without their 'Pantaloons' came to Col. Lawrance's house. The posted guard did not fire on the mutineers and later on joined the rebel force.

16. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., *op. cit.*, NAI.

17. Deposition of Kodra Bheel Sepoy, 7th Company, Mewar Bhil Corps before Captain John D. Brooke, Commander Mewar Bhil Corps. F. & P. Deptt., No. 81-82, Secret Consultation dated 31st July, 1857, NAI.

It is said that two ladies were killed and that children were seized by their legs and thrown into the burning flames.¹⁸ The British fugitives from Neemuch, about 40 men, women and children, reached Dungars being pursued by the rebels and were besieged there. Their fate was doomed, if the Udaipur (Mewar) troops had not reached there in time. On 5th June, mutineers left for Delhi via Agra, having previously released the prisoners in the jail and seized Rupees five thousand from the military chest and Rupees 1,26,900 from the Civil Treasury.¹⁹ But the Sadar Bazar, though a most wealthy and central place, was left untouched and was neither plundered nor burnt.²⁰

Hospitality shown by the Maharana of Udaipur towards the British fugitives

The Europeans who escaped the mutineers and entered Udaipur were most hospitably entertained by the Maharana.²¹ Maharana kept the European refugees at Jagmandir Palace in Pichola lake and appointed Pradhan Gokal Chand Mehta to look after their requirements and safety.²² Captain Annesley reported to Captain C. L. Showers, Political Agent, that the 'Maharana paid us a very handsome compliment by coming here in person yesterday to ascertain that we were provided with every comfort. He asked to see the children and to each he gave, with his own hand, two gold mohars. In the evening they were taken over to the queen, where the Maharana again sent for each, and gave two gold mohars in his own name and two in that of the Rani. In fact nothing could exceed his civility and kindness.²³ The protection generously extended to the British

18. Deposition of Kodra Bheel Sepoy, *op. cit.*, NAI.

19. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

20. Intelligence Report sent by Captain John D. Brooke, Commander Mewar Bhil Corps to the Lt. Governor, North-West Provinces, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 81-83, Secret Consultation dated 31st July, 1857, NAI.

21. *Ibid.*

22. Kavi Raja Shyamaldass: *Vir Vinod*, p. 1966.

23. Letter No. 135 of 1858, dated 2nd February, 1858, from A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P., Deptt., Nos. 1652-54, F.C. Supp., dated 30th December, 1859, NAI.

refugees by the Maharana was acknowledged by the 'special thanks' of the Governor-General.²⁴

Cantonment of Deoli destroyed

Deoli cantonment, in the absence of Kota contingent, was plundered and burnt by Neemuch rebels.²⁵ No British lives were lost as the cantonment was already evacuated earlier. The British personnel were sent to the isolated and hazardous neighbouring Mewar town of Jahazpur where they remained concealed till the arrival of Captain Showers. The Subedar Rugher Singh of the Kota Contingent and 60 out of his 120 men, though forced to accompany the rebels, made good their escape a few days afterwards and returned to Deoli.²⁶

The situation of the nearby places

The situation of Malwa had become critical due to the mutineers at Indore and Mhow which once again threatened the peace at Neemuch. At this time in July, there were nine English officers present at Neemuch. The only reliable force there was the Mewar troops which consisted of 450 Horses and 1,600 Infantry. At this juncture the Chief of Salumber warned the Maharana not to help the English. Captain Showers also received a report from Captain Brookes of Mewar Bhil Corps at Kherwara that Salumber was instigating an attack on his part of Kherwara and the state of affairs was critical.²⁷

Jail out-break at Ajmer

In the meantime on 9th August, an out-break took place

24. A.G.G.'s letter No. 784A of 1858 (No. 117A) to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-3147, F.C. dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

25. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to Gen. Edmonstone, Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, F.C. dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

26. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, *op. cit.*, NAI.

27. C. L. Showers: *A Missing Chapter of Indian Mutiny*, p. 67.

in the Ajmer Jail and about 50 prisoners broke loose²⁸ though the city remained quiet. The civil mounted police (a portion of the same body which at Neemuch, had joined the mutineers) mercilessly cut down the run-aways. The Mohammedans of the city also joined hands with the British Government.²⁹

Disturbances at Nasirabad again

On 12th June, 1857, the first detachment of European Troops from Deesa arrived at Nasirabad and on 10th July A.G.G. in Rajasthan despatched them to Neemuch.³⁰ Their presence was being urgently required as the occupation of the station for a long time by the Raj irregular troops was having an unwholesome effect on the latter. The discontent again appeared among the 12th Bombay N.I. men,³¹ but they were promptly disarmed. On 10th August a trooper of the 1st Bombay Cavalry attempted to create disturbance and try to induce his comrades to mutiny.³² The trooper was cut down, five of the ring leaders of the 12th N.I. were hanged, twenty-five of the disarmed men deserted and 'all the Hindustanees were discharged' by the orders of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan.³³

Disturbances at Neemuch again

At Neemuch on 12th August, 1857, Colonel Jackson of the 2nd Cavalry, commanding the station called out the Europeans, having received a reliable information of an intended mutiny of the native troops in which a general massacre of the European

28. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, F. & P. Deptt., *op. cit.*, NAI.

29. *Ibid.*

30. The troops' strength was 100 men, H.M.'s 83 Regt. 200 men, 12th Bombay, N.I. 1, Squadron, Bombay, Cavalry, 2 Guns from Ajmer Magazine.

31. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, *op. cit.*, F. & P. Deptt. NAI.

32. Melleson: *History of the Indian Mutiny*, Vol. IV, p. 387.

33. Letter No. 784A of 1858, No. 117A, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, F.C. dated 31st December, 1858, NAI.

officers was contemplated." As expected the forces mutinied and in the confusion one European soldier of the 83rd was killed, and two wounded besides one of the officers of the Cavalry, Lt. Blair, was wounded by one of the Europeans with the bayonet.³⁴ The Officer Commanding of the 83rd detachment complained that his men were marched out of the Barracks without his knowledge where Col. Jackson, on the other hand, declared that emergency did not admit of delay to call the officer of the detachment. In fact, this all was due to the differences among the military authorities at such a critical time.³⁵ The Political Agent at Mewar had suggested that to avoid the fear of mutiny in future the British Government should reconsider of 'sending more of these Bombay troops to Neemuch.'³⁶ These disturbances were, however, also suppressed with the help of Udaipur troops.³⁷

Conduct of Rao Bawal

In this context the conduct of Rao of Bawal (Neemuch) is also very remarkable regarding the affairs of Jawad. On 4th June, 1858, Mr. Burton, Offg. Supdt. Neemuch met with the Rao of Bawal. He himself had narrated the whole story of his meeting with the Rao of Bawal in a letter addressed to Captain J. B. Denmys, Supdt. at Neemuch. "On my arrival at Bawal, I recollect being kept waiting an unnecessarily length of time, before the Rao made his appearance, when he did so, was attended by several men armed with lighted matchlocks, his conversation and manner at the time struck me as being far from friendly, for instance, I remember his observing in a careless and unconcerned tone, 'I hear Captain Loyd that most of the

34. Letter dated 13 August, 1857, from Captain C. L. Showers, Offg. Pol. Agent, Mewar, to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., No. 506, Secret Consultation, dated 30th October, 1857, NAI.

35. Letter dated 13th August, 1857, from Captain C. L. Showers Offg. Pol. Agent, Mewar to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

36. Report of the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

37. Letter dated 13th August, 1857, from Captain C. L. Showers, Offg. Pol. Agent, Mewar, *op. cit.*, NAI.

38. Melleeson: *History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. II, p. 387.

Europeans have been murdered by the mutineers who are scouring the country in search of others—therefore trust you will not prolong your stay here, as I am unable to protect, or assist you.”³⁹ Though the second disturbance was suppressed at Neemuch, the Mandasore rebels were collecting the troops to make an invasion of Neemuch after the Mohurram.⁴⁰ The Shahzada of Mandasore who was seated on the Mandasore gaddi with no opposition was collecting a large number of Mewatis, a number of guns and huge money from the bankers to move on Neemuch to extirpate the ‘fringhees’.⁴¹ The second disturbance at Neemuch was severely suppressed by the British. Three men of the 2nd Bombay Cavalry who had been convicted of mutiny before a court martial were hanged on 11th Sept., 1857,⁴² when all the troops of the garrison paraded under arms to witness the cruelty of the Britishers.⁴³

Mandasore Rebels march towards Neemuch

On 8th Nov., 1857 the rebel force proceeded to attack Neemuch.⁴⁴ After keeping the rebels in engagement for an hour the British Officers had to retreat, otherwise it was quite possible that all the forces might have been cut into pieces.⁴⁵ A

39. Letter No. 115 of 1858, dated 12th April, 1858, from L. M. Burton to Captain J. B. Denmyst, Supdt., Neemuch. The Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

40. Intelligence report conveyed by the Pol. Agent, Mewar vide his letter dated 28th August, 1857, No. 516, Secret Consultation, F. & P. Deptt., dated 30th October, 1857, NAI.

41. Intercepted Correspondence, ceased by Captain C. L. Showers at Neemuch dated 28th August, 1857, F. & P. Deptt., No. 515 Secret Consultation, dated 30th October, 1857, NAI.

42. Letter No. 136, dated 11th September, 1857, from Captain C. L. Showers, Offg. Political Agent in Mewar to A.G.G. in Rajasthan, F. & P., No. 496, S.C. dated 30th October, 1857, NAI.

43. F. & P. Deptt., 30th October, 1857, No. 513, S.C., NAI.

44. Letter No. 26 of 1857, dated 8th November, 1857, from Captain C. L. Showers, Political Agent at Mewar, to General Lawrance, A.G.G. in Rajasthan, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 267-271, Secret Consultation dated 29th January, 1858, NAI.

45. Letter No. 282A of 1857, dated 12th November, 1857, from General Lawrance, A.G.G. in Rajasthan to Captain C. L. Showers, Offg. Political Agent, Mewar, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 261-271, S.C. dated 29th January, 1858, NAI.

ed to Awa.⁵³ The British suffered an inglorious defeat and loss of prestige when General Lawrance marched on Awa on 18th September and failed to storm it.⁵⁴ The big casualty of this campaign was Captain Monck Mason, Political Agent in Jodhpur, besides one European and one native killed and three natives wounded.⁵⁵ The head of Monck Mason was cut off and placed over the gateway of the Fort of Awa.⁵⁶ General Lawrance had to retreat and to take shelter in a village three and a half miles from the scene and after three days returned towards Ajmer and Nasirabad. The British Government took a very serious view of this unsuccessful attack and conveyed her displeasure to General Lawrance A.G.G. in Rajasthan as the "British Government had to submit quietly to a repulse which cannot fail to effect its weight and influence in Rajasthan very seriously."⁵⁷ On 12th September, the mutineers issued an appeal to the people of Marwar and Mewar in the name of Risaldar Abdul Ali, Abbas Ali Khan, Sheikh Mohammed Bux and Subedars, Jamedars, and Hindu and Musalman Sepoys who were three thousand in all to give them aid and shelter. The appeal was as follows:⁵⁸

"The Sardars in Mewar and Marwar are in our side. Those who will give us an aid for the sake of the religion will gain reward in heaven and the King will consider them loyal and will honour them."

Awa Chief negotiates with Mewar and Marwar Chiefs

After dealing a crushing defeat to the Britishers Thakur

53. The strength was: 12 per Howitzer, 3-6 per guns, 2-3½ inch mortars, 200-H.M.'s 83rd Foot, 200-1st Bombay Cavalry, 200-Mhairwarrah Battalion, 40-12 Bombay Native-Infantry.

54. Service message sent by W. Muir to G. F. Edmonstone, Secy., G.O.I., Calcutta, dated 27th September, 1857, F. & P. Deptt., Secret Consultation No. 626, dated 18th December, 1857, NAI.

55. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

56. C. L. Showers: *A Missing Chapter of Indian Mutiny*, p. 108.

57. Letter No. 4343, dated 27th October, 1857, from Secy., G.O.I., Fort William, Calcutta, to A.G.G. in Rajasthan, F. & P. Deptt., Secret Consultation No. 494, dated 30th October, 1857, NAI.

58. F. & P. Deptt. Secret Consultation Nos. 249-251, dated 27th November, 1857, NAI.

Kushal Singh of Awa tried to negotiate with the Mewar Chief Thakur Samand Singh.⁵⁹ On Kartik Budi 10th, corresponding with 12th October, 1857, the mutineers of Jodhpur Legion and others moved out of Awa. Samand Singh, the Mewar Chief and other Chiefs of Marwar who were four thousand in number encamped the first day at Dudur. The Mewar Chief marched from Awa, with the intention of "raising all the Chiefs of Marwar and Mewar" with whom and with an army to be obtained from Delhi, he was to subdue the Ajmer district and then excite rebellion in Marwar and Mewar.⁶⁰ On 9th October, Thakur Sheonath Singh of Asop, Thakur Sheonath Singh of Guler, Thakur Ajit Singh of Ulniawas, Thakur Jodh Singh of Bogawa (an accredited agent from Awa), Thakur Paim Singh of Banta, Thakur Chand Singh of Beswana and Thakur Jagat Singh of Tulgari,⁶¹ left for Delhi to receive aid from the King. On 11th October, Thakur Samand Singh also left for Delhi and directed Thakur Jalim Singh to act as per instructions.⁶² However, in view of the activities of the Mewar and Marwar Thakurs and to capture Awa again the A.G.G. in Rajasthan requested the British Government to send re-inforcement immediately.⁶³

Rowa of Sirohi attacked and destroyed

In January, 1858, reinforcement from Bombay reached Raj-

59. Letter dated 13th Dark-half of Kartik, V.S. 1914, corresponding to 15th October, 1857, from Rawal Ranjit Singh of Droghur to Brigd. General Lawrance, A.G.G. in Rajasthan, F. & P. Deptt., 18th December, 1857, Secret Consultation Nos. 214-215, NAI.

60. Letter dated 15th October 1857, from Rawat Ranjit Singh of Droghur to A.G.G. in Rajasthan, *op. cit.*, NAI.

61. Intercepted correspondence—Letter from Samand Singh, Madho Singh and Radha Krishan from Awa dated 7th of Kartik Budi of 1914, corresponding to 9th October, 1857, (name of addressee not given). F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 214-215, S.C. dated 18th December, 1857, NAI.

62. Intercepted correspondence—Letter from Thakur Samand Singh to Thakur Zalim Singh dated 9th of Kartik Budi of 1914, corresponding to 11th October, 1857, F. & P. Deptt. Nos. 214-215, S.C. dated 18th December, 1857, NAI.

63. Letter No. 497 dated 29th October, 1857, from H. L. Anderson, Secy. to Government, Bombay, to Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. No. 345 S.C. dated 27th November, 1857, NAI.

the Thakur of Awa but to break the residences of Thakur of Bhorta, Bheemalia and Lambia were also completely destroyed.⁷² Thus having created terror and panic in the public, the force proceeded to Nasirabad.

Major Burton reaches at Kota

Major Burton was appointed as Political Agent at Kota and Maharao had sent his vakil to receive him. Accordingly, on 15th September, 1857, the Kota vakil arrived at Neemuch with carriage and guards for Major Burton, the Political Agent and a letter from the Kota Maharao requesting him to return.⁷³ On 5th October, Major Burton and two of his sons accordingly started, leaving his wife, daughter and three sons behind, reaching Kota on the evening of the 12th instant. On the same evening "the Maharao fired a salute in honour of the fall of Delhi."⁷⁴ The next day Maharao paid the usual visit to the Agent which the Agent and his sons returned the following afternoon. On this occasion after the public meeting, a private conversation took place at which no one was present, except the Vakil Nand Kishore who was subsequently blown from a gun by the Kota rebels.⁷⁵ The Political Agent then urged the Maharao to dismiss some of his principal officers who were known to be dissatisfied. Except this nothing more is known about their conversation.⁷⁶

Murder of Major Burton

At noon on the 15th October two Kota Raj Pultans calling themselves "Narain" and "Bhowammy" suddenly approached and surrounded the Residency.⁷⁷ The Raj. Guard

72. Letter dated 31 Jany., 1859 from Col. Holmes, Commander of the Force at Awa to Brigd. Gen. G.J.P. Lawrance, A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 1660-61, F.C. dated 30th Dec., 1859, NAI.

73. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy. G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

74. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy. G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

75. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy. G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

76. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy. G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

77. Letter from Captain McDonald on Special duty at Deoli communicating the intelligence of the murder at Kota to A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., No. 37, Secret Consultation, dt. 18th Dec., 1857, NAI.

(Sikhs and Byragees) appear to have been overrun by the rebel force and to have offered no resistance. The rebels murdered Major Burton, the Political Agent, his two sons together with Mr. Solder, Sub-Asstt. Surgeon and a native Christian Doctor at 11 A.M. on the 15th October.⁷⁸ The remains of the Political Agent and his two sons were lying on the floor of the house till 6 A.M. of the 16th October. Major Burton's head was carried off by the rebels, but the bodies were, by the Maharao's orders, interred in the evening in the graveyard.⁷⁹

Rebels rule Kota for Five months

It is said that the plan to kill Major Burton was prepared by the Kota Maharao himself that is why he had asked for his return from Neemuch⁸⁰ where according to the report of the A.G.G. in Raj. the Kota Maharao was forced to sign nine articles, the principal being that "the murder of Political Agent was committed by his orders and to make Jaidayal his chief officer."⁸¹ A commission of enquiry to look into the circumstances of the murder of the Political Agent and his two sons, as to the implication or otherwise of the Maharao, and his ability to save them was constituted. Although the commission unanimously declared "the Maharao innocent, yet he was held responsible for the return of Major Burton to Kota." But there are reasons to believe that commission had accused the Maharao of Kota for the murder of Political Agent and others.⁸² This is why the A.G.G. suggested a fine of Rs. 15 lakhs. But the Maharao was exonerated⁸³ of the charge, it seems, simply be-

78. Letter from Capt. McDonald on Special duty at Deoli to A.G.G., Raj., *op. cit.*, NAI.

79. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy. G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

80. Letter of Gwalior Agent to G.O.I. dt. 26th March, 1858, F. & P. Deptt., No. 137, S.C. dt. 28th May, 1858, NAI.

81. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy. G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

82. Letter No. Nil, dated 17th April, 1858, from A.G.G. in Raj., to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 324-27, F.C. dated 5th August 1859, NAI.

83. F. & P. Deptt., No. 328, S.C. dated 5th August, 1859, NAI.

cause the British Government did not consider it advisable to declare one of the leading princes of Rajasthan as a rebel. Declaring the Maharao a rebel would have needed posting considerable force in Kota to disarm the rebels at a time when the whole city was in an excited mood.⁸⁴ It was due to the ineffective position of the Maharao that the lives of Political Agent and others could not be saved.⁸⁵ In one of the letters the Maharao expressed his grief at the occurrence, his entire ignorance of the plot and his inability to save them.⁸⁶

Maharao Kota requests for British help

During the rule of rebels the Maharao of Kota was more or less imprisoned in the fort. The Maharao repeatedly requested the A.G.G. in Raj. to send the British troops for his protection..... "as the whole city Rampura (now a part of the Kota town), etc., is in the rebels' possession, they have plundered all the city people and bankers' houses besides which my entire country is under them and they (rebels) consume all the revenue and property of the people....Indeed I hardly see how I can escape with my life—although I have been expecting the arrival of a British force and have demanded help from my brother chiefs, I am excessively grieved to find that no one comes yet to assist me."⁸⁷

Retaking of Kota: Rebels could not be captured

Considering the situation in Kota the A.G.G. in Rajasthan called for the troops from Bombay but it was not till March 1858 that the force could be assembled at Nasirabad under

84. General Roberts to A.G.G., F. & P. Deptt., No. 328, F.C. dated 5th August, 1859, NAI.

85. Letter dated 17th April, 1858, from A.G.G. in Raj., to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. No. 325, S.C. dated 5th August, 1858, NAI.

86. F. & P. Deptt., No. 339, S.C. dated 28th May, 1858, NAI.

87. Kharita from Maharao of Kota, dated 6th March, 1858 to the A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Secret Consultation, Nos. 342-43, dt. 28th May, 1858, NAI.

Major-General Roberts⁸⁸ and was further reinforced by H.M.'s 8th Hussars, 450 Sabres, and the Second Beloch Horse, 400 Sabres, totalling the entire strength about 5,500 fighting men.⁸⁹

With this huge army General Roberts attacked Kota. On 29th a heavy fire of shot and shell was opened on the town, and was continued without intermission till the assaulting columns entered the city. But, in spite of all this the largest part of the mutineers escaped and that only one man of consequence Hardyal, brother of Jaidayal Vakeel, was killed in the town otherwise even not a single mutineer could be captured.⁹⁰

88. *The troops were consisted of Artillery*

A. 2nd Class siege Train consisting of 6, 18, Prs. 4-12 Pr. 4-8 in Mortars and 4-8 in Howitzers Total 18 Pieces.

2nd. Troop Bombay Horse artillery 4-6 pr.

3. Troop Bombay horse artillery complete

Horse Battery (European) complete.

Native Foot Artillery—2 Guns

Mountain Train of 6 guns manned by Native Artillery man.

Engineers

11th Company Royal Engineers

A Company Bombay Sappers.

Cavalry

1st Bombay Cavalry (lancers)	300
------------------------------	-----

2nd Bombay Cavalry (lancers)	175
------------------------------	-----

1st Sindh Horse	200
-----------------	-----

Total	675
-------	-----

Infantry

H.M.'s 72nd Highlanders	500
-------------------------	-----

H.M.'s 83rd Foot	700
------------------	-----

H.M.'s 95th Foot	600
------------------	-----

Total European	1,300
----------------	-------

10th Bombay N.I.	600
------------------	-----

12th Bombay N.I.	500
------------------	-----

13th Bombay N.I.	700
------------------	-----

1,800

Total Infantry	3,600
----------------	-------

89. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

90. Letter No. 417 of 1858 (No. 40), dt. 1st April, 1858 from the A.G.G. in Raj., to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 324-27, F.C. dt. 5th August, 1859, NAI.

However, with the British assault the whole city was plundered and rased to the ground.⁹¹

Tantia Tope in Rajasthan

Perhaps the narrative of the Mutineer's activities in Rajasthan will remain incomplete, if Tantia's activities in Rajasthan are not analysed. After being defeated by Sir Charles Napier in the battle of Jaure-Alipur on 22nd June, 1858, Tantia Tope turned towards Rajasthan.⁹² It is believed that the Tantia's forces consisted of 5,000 Gwalior Rebels and 4,000 Bhils.⁹³ Tantia was hopeful of having aid from Jaipur and Harauti where he had sent his emissaries.⁹⁴ Accordingly, he rushed towards Jaipur but General Roberts reached Jaipur before Tantia could take any offensive. On the other side Tantia was being pursued by Col. Holmes and, therefore, instead of reaching Jaipur he changed the direction and reached Tonk along with other rebel leaders, the Nawab of Banda and Rahim Ali Khan.⁹⁵ The Nawab of Tonk did not extend his co-operation and shut himself up in the fort, and the troops sent by the Nawab to engage Tantia, joined the rebels.⁹⁶ From Tonk, Tantia reached Bundi via Indergarh and Madhopur but he could not secure any help from the Maharao of Bundi and turned towards Mewar in the hope that the troops of Udaipur and Salumber will rise in his favour. But here also he had to face disappointment as the Britishers had already taken precautions there.⁹⁷ After all on 9th August, 1858, General Roberts could engage Tantia on the Bank of the river Kotharia but Tantia turned his way. The next encounter took place on 14th August, 1858, on the bank of river Banas in which Tantia lost 700 men and 4 guns.

91 A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

92. Intelligence Branch Report, p. 205, NAI.

93. Showers, C.L., *A Missing Chapter of Indian Mutiny*, pp. 133-47.

94. Intelligence Branch Report, p. 205, NAI.

95. F. & P. Cons. 27, Aug., 1858, No. 153, NAI.

96. Forrest, G.W., *A History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. III, p. 570.

97. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 571.

Tantia Captures Jhalarapatan and Campaign in Central India

After an unsuccessful attempt to secure aid in Udaipur, Tantia crossed the Chambal and reached Jhalarapatan, the Capital of Jhalawar. The troops of Jhalawar joined Tantia and he captured the bulk of Raj Rana's ammunition, bullocks, horses and surrounded his palace.⁹⁸ Tantia demanded Rupees twenty-five lakhs out of which Rs. 5 lakhs were paid by the Raj Rana and on the same night Raja Rana fled to Mhow.⁹⁹ Then Tantia proceeded towards Indore where Holkar was ready to join him. However, after staying for two months in Central India, and defeated by Brigd. Parke at Chota Udaipur Tantia again returned to Rajasthan.

Tantia returned to Rajasthan

On 12th December, 1858, Tantia captured Banswara.¹⁰⁰ But he was pushed out by Major Leim-mouth.¹⁰¹ From Banswara Tantia again entered into Mewar to have fresh support but was pushed by Major Rocke whose command had already arrived to protect Udaipur and Salumber.¹⁰²

Tantia's final defeat and trial

On 13th January, 1859, Prince Firozshah, a rebel leader of Central India, and his followers joined Tantia's troops at Indergarh.¹⁰³ Britishers tried to surround the rebels but Tantia escaped and rushed towards Dausa in Jaipur. On 16th January Brigd. Showers attacked Tantia's troops at Dausa but Tantia could escape again and reached Sikar on 21st January, 1859.¹⁰⁴ Colonel Holmes also reached there and attacked Tantia's forces the same night. The rebels fled in confusion. After his defeat at Sikar Tantia left Rao Sahib and went into the jungle.

98. F. & P., S.C. 24th Sept., 1859, Nos. 56-57, NAI.

99. F. & P. Cons., 4th March, 1859, No. 471, NAI.

100. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 607.

101. Shyamal Dass, *Vir Vinod*, p. 1978.

102. Shyamal Dass, *op. cit.*, p. 1978.

103. Shyamal Dass, *op. cit.*, p. 1978.

104. Intelligence Branch Report, p. 229, NAI.

where he was betrayed and handed over by Man Singh, a Rajput Jagirdar of Narwar to the British on 7th April, 1859, and hanged on 18th April after a short trial at Sikri.¹⁰⁵ Rao Sahib was also arrested in the hills of Punjab and hanged on 20th August, 1862.¹⁰⁶

Having thus briefly narrated the mutineers' activities at various places in Rajasthan, it will be in the fitness of things if the role and conduct of some of native rulers is discussed. The ruling princes due to their weaknesses had become helpless and were left with no other alternative except to support the British regime during the time of mutiny in order to save their own 'Gaddis'.

Jaipur

In Jaipur there were evidences of two attitudes at work, one that of the Maharaja and the other that of the Deewan. It appears that during the minority of Maharaja Ram Singh the Thakurs who were looking after the State had no sympathy with the British. However, Maharaja Ram Singh took care of Captain Eden's wife and family by lodging them in his palace¹⁰⁷ when the mutiny of the escort at the Agency occurred. Maharaja Ram Singh himself suggested for the change of his coinage bearing on it the stamp of Delhi supremacy.¹⁰⁸ This all shows the love of the Maharaja towards the British.

Rawal Sheo Singh and Jaipur Troops Non-cooperate with Britishers

Rawal Sheo Singh, the then minister of the State after his interview with the Political Agent at Kotputli, on his return from Delhi, proceeded to Jaipur. He was a staunch opponent of the British. This is also said that Ex-minister Rawal Sheo

105. Jwala Sahai, *Loyal Rajputana*, pp. 184-87.

106. Kaye and Mallsen: *History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. V, pp. 257-58.

107. A.G.G. in Raj's letters dated 13th Nov., 1857 and of 8th Dec., 1857 to Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., NAI.

108. A.G.G.'s Report to Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

Singh urged the young Maharaja Ram Singh to play a double role being at the same time friends with the Britishers as well as with Delhi.¹⁰⁹ This has also been reported that the Jaipur troops did not co-operate with the Britishers during the critical days of the mutiny¹¹⁰ instead they created problems for them. At one place Captain Hardcastle has remarked, "That the British Government was in no way satisfied with the Jaipur Government for their not being forward in giving assistance, etc."¹¹¹ However, there are reasons to believe that Jaipur troops did not co-operate wholeheartedly with the British to suppress the mutiny.

Anti-British feelings among the Jaipur Darbar Officials

Rawal Sheo Singh. Nawab Walayat Ali Khan, Miyan Usman Khan and Saddollah Khan, Fowjdar of the city had been in Delhi during the period of crisis but as soon as they returned from Delhi were placed under arrest. An anti-British correspondence between Usman Khan and Saddollah Khan with Delhi was brought to the notice of the Maharaja by the Political Agent. In the house of Usman Khan, a pensioner of the Raj, 200 arms were found.¹¹² These State prisoners were declared guilty and Walayat Ali Khan and Usman Khan were confined in separate forts in the District.

Alwar

H. H. the Maharaja of Alwar (Banie Singh) after a long

109. A.G.G.'s Report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

110. Report of Asstt. Captain Hardcastle to Capt. Eden, F. & P. Deptt., No. 777, F.C. dated 30th Dec., 1859, NAI. In fact there is a controversy between Capt. Hardcastle and Capt. Eden, Political Agent, over the co-operation of Jaipur troops with the British cause. Capt. Eden has vehemently opposed Capt. Hardcastle's report on the role played by Jaipur troops, instead Capt. Eden has praised the Maharaja and the Jaipur. Letter dated 14th August, 1857 from Capt. Eden, Pol. Agent, Jaipur to the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, F. & P. Deptt., No. 777, F.C., dt. 30th Dec., 1859, NAI.

111. Capt. Hardcastle's observation on Jaipur troops reported to Capt. Eden. F. & P. Deptt., No. 777, F.C., dt. 30th Dec., 1859, NAI.

112. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

illness died in July, 1857, and his son and heir Sheodan Singh, a youth of 13 years, succeeded the throne on the 30th July, 1857. A number of Delhi rebels were detected in Alwar, and apprehended by the local authorities handed over by the Alwar guards to the British Officers.¹¹²

Bharatpur

Bharatpur lying so near Agra which tried to keep herself away from mutinous activities. On 28th May, 1857, Major Morrison took over charge of the Residency at Bharatpur from Captain Nixon when the latter retired to Agra. After the mutiny of the Bharatpur troops at Hoodul on 31st May, the Bharatpur Sardars and all the officials of the State were in a State of great excitement. The Bharatpur Sardars explained to Major Morrison to leave Bharatpur immediately as there was every fear that army—which consisted mostly of the Musalmans and Poorbia Sepoys—might attack the Resident.¹¹³ Secondly, the Bharatpur Sardars pointed out that the presence of the British officers at Bharatpur was likely to attract the Neemuch mutineers and give them a pretext to sack the city.¹¹⁴ At the earlier stage Major Morrison declined to retire to Agra but when on 5th July, 1857, in the battle of Shabganj, which was fought near Agra and where the British forces were shut up in the Fort of Agra,¹¹⁵ Major Morrison could realise the seriousness of the situation and retired to Agra after handing over the charge of the State to the "Dhao", or male nurse of the young Raja named Gulab Singh.¹¹⁷

113. Letter from Pol. Agent at Jaipur to the A.G.G. in Raj. F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, dated 31st Dec., 1858, NAI.

114. Memo. dt. 19th Sept., 1857, sent by Capt. Nixon, Offg. Asstt. to the A.G.G., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 11-14 F.C. dated 30th Oct., 1857, NAI.

115. Memo. dt. 19th Sept., 1857, sent by Capt. Nixon, *op. cit.* NAI.

116. Memo. dt. 19th Sept., 1857 sent by Capt. Nixon, *op. cit.* NAI.

117. F. & P. Deptt., Secret Cnosultation, Nos. 436-40, dated 25th Sept., 1857, NAI.

Bikaner

The personal interest taken by the Maharaja in suppressing the mutiny, by taking the field at the head of his troops and through levies raised for the restoration of order affords a striking example of the Maharaja's loyalty towards the British Government. The Maharaja sent 1,700 troops to occupy the Hissar and 1,000 men and 2 guns for the relief of Hansi.¹¹⁸ In appreciation of the services rendered by the Maharaja of Bikaner, it was suggested that "Paintalissa" villages of the district of Hissar may be presented to the Maharaja.¹¹⁹ A 'Hukumnamah' was issued by the Maharaja of Bikaner to all the Subedars, Resauldars, Officers and Jamadars appealing them not to fight any more and for an unconditional surrender.¹²⁰ Maharaja himself requested the A.G.G. in some cases to release certain mutineers.¹²¹

Dholpur

Maharaj Rana Bhagwat Singh of Dholpur also rendered considerable help to the British in consolidating their position in India. So much so that a force was sent to Mathura, a Dholpur Perganah on the Karauli border, where the crisis was feared.¹²² The British refugees from Gwalior were on their way through Dholpur, hospitably received, guarded and escorted to Agra. But the Rana's army and Sardars sympathised with the rebels. "Some of the Chief Officers of the Rana joined the rebels. Rana's authority was set at nought, Durbar plundered and the District was put under exactions."¹²³

118. Epitome of Lt. Mildmay's report of services rendered by the forces of H.H. the Maharaja of Bikaner, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 35-36, Secret Consultation, dated 18th Dec., 1857, NAI.

119. Letter No. 644, dated 15th Sept., 1859 from R.H. Davis, Secy. to Govt. of Punjab to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P., Nos. 289-90, dt. 29th Jan., 1858, NAI.

120. *Ibid.*

121. *Ibid.*

122. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

123. Letter No. 95 of 1858 from Capt. J.P. Nixon to the Secy., G.O.I., N.W.P., Allahabad, dt. 3rd March, 1858, F. & P. Deptt., No. 324, Secret, dated 28th May, 1858, NAI.

Maharaj Rana surrounded and harassed by rebels

The Maharaj Rana surrounded and pressurized by the rebels (who even threatened to take his own life), was constrained to agree to their demands. About 1,000 mutineers under Rao Ram Chandra and Hira Lal took with them most of the Rana's guns and advanced towards Agra. Later, the mutineers were disbanded and their arms were captured by the British force.¹²⁴ To avoid further disturbances Maharaj Rana was advised not to disband any more of his troops as it would only increase the number of rebels.¹²⁵ In fact for a considerable period Maharaj Rana remained under the escort of rebels and his authority was in abeyance until December, 1857, when at his own request Patiala chief, related to him through marriage, the Chief Commissioner of Punjab and NWP sent a force of 2,000 Sikhs and 4 guns to Dholpur to provide protection and to restore order.

Karauli

Maharaja Madan Pal of Karauli extended full support to the British in maintaining their rule in India. As soon as the mutiny broke out in May, 1857, he despatched all available troops towards Agra and raised as many new levies as possible. At the same time the Maharaja issued a proclamation to his subjects strongly criticising the anti-Raj activities of the sepoys. He called upon his people "not only not to join the rebels but to help him in fighting for the Government."¹²⁶ Maharaja Madan Pal also came at the rescue of the Kota Maharao and despatched his troops to his aid.

Tonk

Tonk was the only State in Rajasthan with a Mohamedan Prince as its ruler. In response to a circular letter of 23rd May, 1857, issued to all the Chiefs of Rajasthan, the Nawab

124. Letter No. 95 of 1858, dt. 3rd March, 1858 from Capt. J.P. Nixon to the Secy., G.O.I., N.W.P., Allahabad, *op. cit.*, NAI.

125. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

126. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

Wazir Khan expressed his loyalty and readiness to help the British Government although his forces had already mutinied.

Nawab is put to house arrest

The Tonk troops had not only mutinied against the Nawab in support of the cause of mutiny but even had invited the Neemuch mutineers on their route to Agra to visit Tonk. Virtually the Nawab was put under house arrest by his own soldiery and was powerless to help the Britishers for all practical purposes.¹²⁷ In spite of all this, on 25th August, 1857, he informed the A.G.G. in Rajasthan that "his rebel troops have marched towards Delhi and no European Officers might be allowed to pass through his district, being unsafe."¹²⁸ The people of Tonk were not happy with this attitude of the Nawab and used to abuse him as "Christian".¹²⁹

Nawab's attitude mysterious

But there are reasons to believe that Britishers were not wholly convinced about the pro-British attitude of the Nawab. Since the Tonk troops had fought against Britishers at Delhi and had actively participated in the rebellion, it was quite possible that the Nawab might be having sympathies with the rebels, and, this prompted the British Government to stop the monthly allowances of Rs. 12,500 to the Nawab,¹³⁰ and to seize Nimbaher, a Tonk Purgana by the Political Agent of Mewar. The demands extorted from him by his mutinous soldiery and servants and the loans which he had been obliged to raise at the heavy interest further strengthen British suspicion as to his loyalty.

Jhalawar

Like the other Chiefs of Rajputana Jhalawar also extended active co-operation in supporting the British and in suppressing

127. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

128. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

129. A.G.G.'s letter No. 297 of 5th March, to Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., NAI.

130. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., *op. cit.*, NAI.

the mutiny. A proclamation was issued on 28th November, 1857, by the Maharaja of Jhalawar, directing the public to "assist the State in capturing the well-known Neemuch muti-neer Heera Singh announcing a reward of Rs. one thousand for him and for the apprehension of other rebels awarding Rs. 25 for each sawar and Rs. 10 for each infantry soldier."¹³¹

Rajasthan Princes and reconquest of Delhi by Britishers

When Delhi was recaptured by the British forces after the failure of mutiny, a number of princes sent a word of congratulations to the H.E. the Queen of Great Britain. A Kharita from the Maharaja of Jhalawar¹³² and Jaipur¹³³ was also sent to the A.G.G. in Rajasthan conveying their congratulations and wishing for a healthy, and prosperous British empire in India. This is sufficient to prove that the native chiefs had already lost the national feeling, if they had it ever, having any, and had become the 'yes men' or the agents of British imperialism in India.

Suppression of the Mutiny by the Britishers

In spite of the active co-operation of the native princes, had the revolt spread all over India, it would have been difficult for the British to reconquer India. They would have been doomed to suffer the Eastern Empire to pass into an ignominious tradition.¹³⁴ In suppressing the mutiny, every act of treachery was committed by the Britishers. Kaye himself confessed, "Though I have plenty of letters with me describing the terrible and cruel tortures committed by our officers, I do not write a word about it, so that this subject should be no longer before the world."¹³⁵ The cruel and bitter measures adopted by the British Government in suppressing the rebels in Nasirabad, Neemuch, Awa

131. F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 249-50, Secret Consultation, dated 29th Jany., 1858, NAI.

132. F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 153-54, F.C., dt. 5th Feb., 1858, NAI.

133. F. & P., Deptt., No. 384, F.C., dt. 31st Dec., 1858, NAI.

134. Malleson: *History of the Indian Mutiny*, Vol. V.

135. Kaye: *The History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. I.

and Kota are an evidence to prove that the people were brutally crushed down and their property was looted and destroyed and the most outrageous thing was that the British army personnel who looted public and private property were rewarded and to reward them a committee was constituted.¹³⁶

The character of the out-break of Mutiny in Rajasthan

It now remains for us to assess the nature of the out-break of Mutiny in Rajasthan in the context of the events and the participants of the great out-break of 1857. At the very outset it is evident that those who took part in the revolt, constituted a very small minority. This minority consisted of some aggrieved Thakurs, their associates and native troops of Hindus and Muslims. The civil population abstained from joining the insurgents. Thus the lack of universal support was responsible for not characterising it as a national revolt.

The Thakurs of Awa, Gulor, Asop and Salumber, etc., who headed the revolt had nothing to do with the national up-surge. They were waging their own private wars with their liege-lord. They had no grievance against the British. It was only a chance that the mutineers from Euranpura passed through Awa on their way to Narnol. They only participated for a day in the battle which Thakur Kushal Singh, the chief of Awa, had initiated. Next day when the battle was still going on they left him with a quaint hope that he would continue it single handed. This further suggests that the out-break was never pre-planned. It was a spontaneous reaction on the part of those who had suffered on account of British treachery.

The active participation of the Muslim officers like Mahabab Khan of Kota, Risaldar Abbasati and Shahzada Firoz Shah of Mandasor was a temporary phase inattended by one idea of national independence. They took up the leadership only on an appeal from the Emperor associated with a religious call. They assumed the leadership of the Afghans, Makranis and other Muslims in the name of their faith and the Quran.

136. A.G.G.'s report to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 3146-47, F.C., dated 31st Dec., 1858, NAI.

It can in no circumstances be classed as a national endeavour to liberate our land.

The worst part of the Mutiny is that the rulers of Rajasthan clung fast to their British masters. They actively helped the British officers and offered their services for the imperial interest.

The spirit of nationalism which so deeply underlined political movements and wars of liberation in the west was totally absent among the Indian masses. As a matter of fact anti-British cries raised by Munshi Jai Dayal and various other native troops urging the people and the army to drive away the British were but isolated acts of a few individuals. The Princes observed the traditional policy of following whoever held paramount power in India. The Princes wanted to take advantage of the disturbances created by the mutineers so that they could get rid of the foreign control and restore old order in which the hereditary rulers and the Thakurs may have full freedom to enjoy their traditional rights. But in course of time the patriotic and nationalist feelings ran high and impelled people to sacrifice their lives for the country. The challenge to British authority by Arjun Lal Sethi, Vijai Singh Pathik, Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa and others the account of which will be narrated in the following pages, had its root in the mutiny in a sense that future generation drew inspirations from the heroic fights of those who mutinied for one reason or another.

CHAPTER III

AGE OF REFORMS AND SEEDS OF REAL AWAKENING

Queen's proclamation

The mutiny in India was over, but in the eyes of the statesmen of England the danger of another disturbance had not disappeared completely. In order to avert such a danger it was rightly deemed that the Crown should take over the control of the Indian Government. As a result, the Act for the Better-Government in India, was passed on 2nd August 1858, and the President of the Board of Control was replaced by the Secretary of State for India. On 1st September, 1858, the Court of Directors "finally handed over the administration to their sovereign and the Governor-General received the title of Viceroy."

The assumption of the Government of India by the Sovereign of Great Britain was announced by Lord Canning at a Darbar held at Allahabad on 1st November, 1858, in the name of Queen Victoria. The Queen's proclamation confirmed the treaties and engagements of the East-India Company, with the Indian Princes, and promised to respect the rights, dignity and

1. The rule of the East India Co. had been a matter of bitter criticism in England. In the House of Commons Sir George Cornwall Lewis had observed: "I do most confidently maintain that no civilized Government ever existed on the face of this earth which was more corrupt, more perfidious and more rapacious than the Government of East India Company from the year 1765 to 1784."

Raulinson: *The British Government in India*, p. 109.

honour of the native Princes, and to pay due regard to the ancient rights, usages and customs of India; disclaimed all desire for the extension of British territorial possessions in India through "encroachment on those of others," granted a general amnesty to "all officials save and except those who have been and shall be convicted of having directly taken part in the murder of British subjects", proclaimed a policy of justice, benevolence and religious toleration; and declared that all "of whatever race or creed, may be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service...."²

By the proclamation the native States in reality were reduced to the position of subordinate entities. Lord Canning himself admitted this position in regard to the relation of the Government of India with the States. On 30th April, 1860, he declared, despite all the sweet assurances of the Queen about "new interventions" in the State affairs that, "the Government of India is not precluded, from stepping into to set right such serious abuses in a native Government as may threaten any part of the country with anarchy or disturbance nor from assuming any temporary charge of a native State when there shall be sufficient reason."³ This assertion of the Crown's authority over the States was further classified by Lord Canning in 1862, when he said, "The Crown of England stood forward as the unquestioned ruler and Paramount power in all India and was for the first time to face with feudatories, and that there was a reality in the suzerainty of the sovereign of England which never existed before and which was eagerly acknowledged by the chiefs."⁴ Thus the States, "from the foreign and independent allies of sovereign co-operation" were transformed into protected feudatories.⁵ The supremacy of the Crown was finally established and acknowledged in 1877," in more emphatic form than it had ever received before, by the

2. Melleson: *History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. V, pp. 275-76.

3. Roberts, P.: *British India*, p. 384.

4. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. IV, p. 490.

5. Pannikar, K.M.: *British Policy Towards Indian States*, p. 34.

assumption by Queen Victoria of the title of '*Kaiser-e-Hind, Empress of India*.'⁶

The Princes and the Proclamation

Whatever may have been the outcome of the proclamation, it is to be admitted that it foreshadowed the most fundamental change of attitude in the relationship between the British Government and the Indian Princes. The rejoicing and the gratitude expressed by the native chiefs were tantamount to accepting the proclamation as "protector of their 'Gaddis' and the British Government as their saviour."

Demonstration of rejoicing at Mewar

The proclamation was welcomed enthusiastically throughout India. The Native Princes and the people of Rajasthan also participated in various celebrations to express their gratitude to the Queen. In Mewar a general illumination and display of fire-works, a dinner to the European troops and distribution of sweetmeats to the native troops took place.⁷ After the dinner the Rao of Bedla proposed the Queen's health, and in so doing, expressed on the part of the Maharana, the gratification His Highness felt at the event in as much as he was thereby brought into more immediate alliance with and under the more direct protection of the Queen of England.⁸

After the rejoicing a Kharita⁹ was sent by the Maharana of Udaipur expressing his gratitude towards the British Queen. It reads: "The announcement made in the Royalhood, that the Queen of England is coming to rule over us has shed light and joy over this darkened land like the moon rising upon the

6. Stratchey, William: *India and Its Administration*, p. 510.

7. Letter No. 323 of 1858, (Encls. No. 199 of 1858) dated 13th Nov., 1858 from Capt. C.L. Thomus, Offg. Political Agent, Mewar, to Brig. Gen. Lt. P.L. Lamena, Offg. A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., dated 31st Dec., 1858, Nos. 3143-45, F.C. NAI.

8. Letter No. 323 of 1858, dated 13th Nov., 1858, *op. cit.*, NAI

9. Kharita, dt. Nil. from the Maharana of Udaipur, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 31st Dec., 1858, Nos. 3143-45, F.C. NAI.

night. Impelled by the emotions which fill my breast I hasten to offer my humble tribute of loyalty to your Majesty, and with the spontaneous pouring out of my joy, I desire to give expression to my grateful feelings for your sense of solicitude for your Indian subjects, evinced by the act by which your Majesty has taken us all under your immediate protection, and has thus removed the intermediate link and has riveted the chain of affection by which my humble throne is brought nearer, and bound inseparably to your high throne."

Ceremonies held at Neemuch and Jodhpur, etc.

The Maharaja and inhabitants of Jodhpur, Neemuch and Pratabgarh, etc., also expressed their rejoicing,¹⁰ on the eve of the Queen's proclamation, in the ceremonies organised at Neemuch. The Political Agent read out the proclamation at a full dress parade of the troops, both in English and vernacular, and a royal salute was fired at the conclusion followed by three cheers by the troops. In Neemuch, on 1st November, 1858, sports were organised to witness the occasion.¹¹ In Pratabgarh, a public fare was organised in which a race of bullock-carts took place. In the evening in Neemuch as well as in Jodhpur, Pratabgarh, Banswara and Sirohi the display of fire-works took place and the occasion was celebrated by an illumination.¹²

Administrative Reforms in the Indian States on the British-Indian Pattern

When the rejoicings were over the effects of the proclamation were felt in the administrative sphere. The Princes and the British administration came closer and a number of treaties, viz., Salt Agreement, Railway Agreement, Coinage and Postal Agreement, Extradition treaties, etc., were signed between the British Government and the Native States. The British policy underwent a new change and a policy of 'subordinate union' was followed which remained in force till 1906 after

10. F. & P. Deptt., dt. 31st Dec., 1858, Nos. 3143-45, F.C. NAI.

11. F. & P. Deptt., dt. 31st Dec., 1858, Nos. 3143-45, F.C. NAI.

12. F. & P. Deptt., dt. 31st Dec, 1858, Nos. 3143-45, F.C. NAI.

which a new policy of 'trust and co-operation' was adopted."

This involved a process of infiltration into the States, mainly in the economic field, without annexing their territories. The lines of communication, such as railways, and postal facilities could develop only on a national basis. The one feature which distinguished the British negotiations with the Princes during this period is the larger attention given to the matters of common interest such as communications, currencies, tariff, and other fiscal policies, rights and sources of irrigation, extradition, extra-territorial jurisdiction, etc." This brought about the administrative and economic unity over the whole country including the States. This new policy transformed the States into an integral part of Indian policy.

The native States were advised by the Political Agent to introduce reforms in their respective territories. The native Princes were also advised to take an active part in the day to day administration of the State." Let us examine these changes statewise to see how in the internal affairs of the States the British influence crept in.

Mewar (Udaipur)

After the death of Rana Swaroop Singh on 16th November, 1861, the entire administration of Mewar had become corrupted. During the minority of Rana Shambhu Singh, a council was appointed by the Political Agent but it could not work successfully. In order to make necessary improvements, therefore, on 19th August, 1863, a public notification was issued by Lt. Colonel Eden stating" that "up to now the Government of Mewar has been carried on by Council of Regency. An order of the Government has now been arrived for a new arrangement, either of a new Council of several chiefs or one as a

13. Singh, G.N.: *Indian States and British India—Their Future Relations*, p. 35.

14. Singh, G.N.: *op. cit.*, p. 37.

15. Kharita, dt. 31st Dec., 1883 from Lord Ripon, the G.G. and Viceroy of India to Maharaja Dungar Singh of Bikaner (Indian States Committee Report, p. 43).

16. Gehlot, J.S.: *Rajputana Ka Itihas*, Vol. I, p. 280, F. & P. Deptt., dt. 21st August, 1863, Nos. 206-296, F.C. NAI.

Regent, as may appear to us most desirable. Until the new arrangement shall be completed, the whole administration derives on me.”

But such a notification created a sense of disaffection among the nobles and the people of Mewar. A tense situation developed gradually. The Political Agent, therefore, feared that as the Dashera festival was ahead some disturbances might occur on that occasion as the festival would provide an opportunity to all the nobles of the State to assemble in the capital.¹⁷ In order to avoid unpleasant happenings he at once procured a considerable increase in his escort.

Uproar in Udaipur

As suspected a number of disturbances took place in Udaipur on the eve of Dashera festival in the year 1863. The situation was tense and fraught with intense resentment. Some posters were seen on the city walls, “upbraiding the Maharana and the chiefs sitting silent, while the English Raj was being introduced in Mewar.”¹⁸ Although no untoward incident took place in Udaipur, the Chiefs of the State presented a memorandum of grievances to the British Government demanding that the “State affairs should be conducted with an advisory body of five chiefs, as had been the tradition of the State, that the imposition of fines in the cases of Sati should be stopped and that no change be made in the system of customs duties being levied in Mewar.”¹⁹

Reforms introduced by Captain Eden in Mewar

At this juncture, the administration in Mewar was crude and disorganised. There was no principle of justice and uncivilized customs like that of selling and purchasing of babies were rampant. Captain Eden stopped such practices by putting the courts in the hands of foreign officials employed by the Political Agent, as natives did not possess required ability

17. F. & P. Deptt., dt. Dec., 1863, Nos. 43-47, F.C. NAI.

18. F. & P. Deptt., dt. Dec., 1863, Nos. 43-47, F.C. NAI.

19. F. & P. Deptt., dt. Dec., 1863, Nos. 43-47, F.C. NAI.

and qualities for manning these offices. He also introduced at the first time certain principles of Indian Penal Code in administering justice to the people and for ending several barbarous and uncivilized practices which had become the basis of meeting out punishment to the accused.²¹ The mode of revenue collection was changed with the result, that in a very short time the State income was raised to Rs. 24,75,000 with a saving of Rs. 3,00,000 per year.²² Steps were also taken to manage and supervise the revenue collections effectively.

Social reforms

For the first time a Government School known as 'Shambhoo Ratna-Pathshala' was started and a hospital was also opened by spending about one lakh of rupees. Necessary reforms were made in Jails to treat the prisoners with kindness. Mounted Police guards were posted in the city to provide greater security of life and property. Attempts were made to improve the sanitation of the city. A department of Deosthan was established to manage the administration of religious temples with a view to managing the income and expenditure of these sacred places and to supervise the expenditure of the amount saved at the time of natural calamities such as famine, flood, etc. The construction of roads also received the attention and Udaipur was linked with Neemuch and Kherwara by road.²³ The sale and purchase of children and women, compulsory labour (begar), witch-swinging, etc., which in spite of their barbarity had become established customs, were also stopped by a proclamation issued in September, 1863.²⁴

Reaction to the Reforms

However, the chiefs, State officials and the people looked at these reforms with suspicion and believed that these reforms were designed to dishonour their traditions and were a pretext

20. Kaviraja Shyamaldas: *Vir Vinod*, p. 2074.

21. Nixon, J.P.: *Mewar Agency Report*, 1864-65.

22. F. & P. Deptt., dt. March, 1862, Nos. 39-42, F.C. NAI.

23. *Rajputana Agency Records*, (Confidential), 1846, Slavery, No. 2, NAI.

to enhance British interference in their own affairs. This resentment was expressed through strikes and agitation.²⁴

On 23rd December, 1863, Nizamuddin Khan, the Superintendent of Police, Udaipur, issued a notification²⁵ by ending the system of 'AN'. According to the notification 'AN' was declared "contrary to Law and any one practising was liable to punishment."²⁶ The announcement was made in the city by the beat of drums. This created a stir in the city and public resentment was shared by the Maharana himself²⁷ along with other chiefs and officials of the State.

Hartal of 1864

On 30th March, 1864, a complete 'Hartal' was observed in the city.²⁸ All the shops remained closed and about two thousand to three thousand people under the leadership of Nagar-Seth Champa Lal demonstrated²⁹ at the residence of Captain Eden, the Political Agent at Mewar.

Demands of the Demonstrators

Captain Eden, the Political Agent, tried to pacify the agitators but the agitators refused to hear the advice of the Political Agent and made the following demands:³⁰

1. The ancient customs of 'AN' should be restored.
2. The harassment of the traders by the police should be stopped.
3. Mortgages and names of the Parties concerned in the transaction should not be recorded in the Police Kotwali.

24. F. & P. Deptt., dt. July 1864, No. 30, F.C. NAI, F. & P. Deptt., dt. Dec., 1863, Nos. 43-47, F.C. NAI.

25. F. & P. Deptt., dt. July, 1864, Nos. 30-42, F.C. NAI.

26. 'AN' was called to be an oath of allegiance. This also prevailed among the Jagirdars of Jodhpur State.

27. F. & P. Deptt., dt. July, 1864, Nos. 30-42, F.C. NAI.

28. F. & P. Deptt., dt. July, 1864, Nos. 30-42, F.C. NAI.

29. F. & P. Deptt., dt. July, 1864, Nos. 30-42, F.C. NAI.

30. Sahiwala: '*Arjun Singh Ka Jeewan Charitra*', p. 3.

31. F. & P. Deptt., dt. July, 1864, Nos. 30-42, F.C. NAI.

4. The order prohibiting slavery and buying and selling of children should be rescinded.
5. Settlement of the cases conducted with caste and mercantile transactions would be conducted according to the old Rajwara custom.
6. Complaints that can be settled, assembling at the "Sethji's shop", according to the practice of Panchayat, should be so restored, so also cases concerning quarrel between a husband and wife.
7. In regard to Fouzdari, Diwani and Kotwali courts the old custom of employing some persons of position in the city as Judges to preside should be restored.

Colonel Eden assaulted

In response to the demonstrator's demands Colonel Eden tried to explain the Government policy but the mob became violent and it is stated that abuses were hurled at him and even shoes and stones were thrown.³² With the result the demonstrators were forcibly removed³³ by the guards of the Political Agent. People then moved towards the garden 'Sahaliyon ki Bari' to resolve to place their complaints before the A.G.G. in Rajasthan.

Assurances given to the Demonstrators

The strike continued for several days though it is said that after two or three days the Bohra and Gujarati traders opened their shops.³⁴ The situation, however, continued to be tense. Later, the co-operation of the Maharana was sought and on 6th April, 1864, the Political Agent accompanied by the young Maharana went to see the leaders of the movement and some assurances were given to look into their grievances, with the result that the strike ended.³⁵

Commenting on the whole incident, the A.G.G. wrote to

32. F. & P. Deput., dt. July, 1861, Nos. 30-42, F.C. NAI.

33. Kavi Raja Shyamaldas: *Vir-Vinod*, p. 2069.

34. F. & P. Deput., *op. cit.*, Nos. 30-42, NAI.

35. Kaviraja Shyamaldas: *Vir-Vinod*.

Colonel Eden, the Political Agent, "you have been attempting too much, more than contemplated in the Government order of August, 1863."³⁶ He further observed, "that...Eden's conduct has not been judicious with the chiefs, the leading courtiers and so many of the influential classes against him....Eden should endeavour to associate the Maharana with him in all he does, gain his consent in all such changes which were likely to prove unpopular and orders should be carried out in the name of Maharana himself."³⁷ Later Colonel Alliot, the A.G.G. in Rajputana, himself proceeded to Udaipur to make an enquiry on the spot as well as to gain sympathy of the people.

Other reforms introduced

This had the desired effect and the Maharana was convinced of the necessity of introducing reforms. The outlook of the Maharana was changed due to two main reasons. Firstly, the Political Agent had advised the Maharana for taking immediate steps to make improvements in the administration and secondly, Lord Mayo, Governor-General and Viceroy of India, placed great emphasis on introducing administrative and social reforms in the native States at Ajmer Darbar in 1870. Addressing the Darbar Lord Mayo had suggested:³⁸

"...we demand that everywhere throughout the length and breadth of Rajputana, justice and order should prevail, that you should make roads and undertake the construction works of irrigation and encourage education and provide relief for the sick...."

Accordingly in 1870, some measures were adopted to improve the administration of civil and criminal justice. Arjun Singh and Shamim Ali Khan were appointed to see the civil

36. Letter dt. 24th May, 1864, from the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Political Agent. F. & P., Deptt., Nos. 30-42, F.C., dt. July, 1864, NAI.

37. Letter dt. 23rd June, 1864, from the A.G.G. in Raj. to the Political Agent, F. & P. Deptt., Nos. 30-42, F.C., *op. cit.*, NAI.

38. *Rajputana Agency Records*, 1870, No. 12, List II, NAI.

and criminal courts respectively.³⁹ In the year 1870 a new code of law for the State of Mewar compiled by Lt. Keating, the A.G.G., was introduced and all forms of punishment involving physical torture were abolished and instead a new process of fines and imprisonment introduced. Thus, in future the administration of Justice was to be guided by the codes of British-India, Hindu Law and Local customs.⁴⁰ The State of Mewar was divided in various districts and a topographical survey of the State was conducted by two English officers, Captain Charles G. Strachen and Lt. Holdich.⁴¹ The troops were also re-organised and railway lines were laid.

After the death of Maharana Shambhu Singh, Maharana Sajjan Singh (1874-1884), continued the chain of reforms and on 10th March 1877,⁴² he announced the establishment of a new State Council 'Ijlas Khas' (Privy Council). However, council could not work satisfactorily.

Second Strike in Udaipur

The reforms introduced were again not welcomed by the people of Udaipur with the result that an agitation was launched by the Udaipur traders. A strike was observed in the Udaipur city but the Maharana dealt with a strong hand and on 11th February, 1878, Seth Champa Lal and four other traders were arrested and sent to jail.⁴³ The Maharana threatened that more severe action would be taken in case the strike was not called off. The strike was withdrawn consequently.⁴⁴

Jat agitation in Udaipur

During the minority regime of Maharana Fateh Singh, the agitators were encouraged by the Baniyas, Hakims, officials and even by the chiefs of Salumber and Bhinder to launch a

39. F. & P. Deptt., dt. May, 1870, Nos. 119-122, F.C. NAL.

40. F. & P. Deptt., dt. May, 1870, Nos. 119-122, F.C. NAL.

41. *Mewar Agency Report*, 1875-71.

42. Kaviraja Shyamaldas: *Vir-Vinod*, p. 2191.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 2195.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 2195.

movement against the new land revenue system. On 22nd June, 1880 at a sacred place called 'Matri Kundiyan' in Rashmi Pergana, hundreds of Jat peasants swore in the night of full moon that they would not plough or furnish any assistance to the Amin until they place their grievances before the Udaipur Darbar and are redressed by the Maharana. On 18th July, 1880, a deputation of about two hundred and fifty cultivators including few Baniyas came down to Udaipur and placed their grievances before the Maharana. Maharana assured the Jat agitators that the reforms were in their own interest and their rights would not be adversely affected.⁴⁵ However, the discontent continued till the end of July, 1880.

The Maharana opposed day-to-day British intervention in Mewar affairs

Though the reforms on British India pattern were introduced in Mewar yet Maharana Fateh Singh was not in favour of the British interference in the day-to-day administration of Mewar, with the result that on various issues differences arose between the Maharana and the British Resident. The Resident's view was supported by all the British officials of the State along with the Prime Minister Pannalal, whereas the Maharana's views were supported by the important courtiers as Maharaja Gaj Singh Kothari, Balawant Singh, Brijnath and Joshi Narayandas.⁴⁶ Later the Maharana retired Pannalal, the Prime Minister, and assumed all powers.⁴⁷

Origin of the Council: British interference in Bikaner

During the regime of Maharaja Sardar Singh (1851-1872) the GOI deputed Captain Bradford on special duty to Bikaner in 1871. He sent a detailed report on the mal-administration of the State.⁴⁸ The administration needed complete overhauling

45. F. & P. Dep'tt., Revenue, May, 1881, Nos. 5-10, NAI.

46. F. & P. Dep'tt., dt. Oct., 1885, Nos. 60-80, Int'l., NAI.

47. F. & P. Dep'tt., dt. July, 1901, Nos. 125-28, Int'l., NAI.

48. Aitchison: *Engagements, Treaties and Sanads*, Vol. III, pp. 296-97.

as there was not a single department of the State in which the most urgent need for reform did not exist. Due to the heavy arrears which were to be paid to the troops and the current expenditure, the treasury became empty. The Maharana had no confidence in the Diwan of the State, Pt. Manphool, whereas Captain Bradford considered him an experienced and capable person. These differences between the Maharaja and the Diwan affected the smooth running of the State machinery. Simultaneously opposition among the Thakurs of the State also rose as their voice was not heard even in the administrative affairs.⁴⁹ Captain Bradford, therefore, suggested that a Council be established to advise the ruler in matters of the administration.⁵⁰ The Maharaja agreed to this idea and a Council was formed consisting of five persons⁵¹ including Pandit Manphool as Diwan and its President. The main function of the Council was to aid and advise the ruler in matters of administration but he was not bound to accept the advice of the Council. The Maharaja, however, had promised⁵² that he would consult the Council, would not permit the interference of his favourites and would not allow a single day to pass without meeting the Council for the transaction of State business. But in practice the Maharaja did not fulfil his promises and entrusted the management of the State to Bakshiram and other favourites on account of which anarchy and confusion prevailed and the State was brought to the brink of ruin.⁵³ During the regime of Maharaja Dungar Singh (1872-1887) in the year 1883, an attempt to raise the 'REKH' or money payment taken from the Thakurs in commutation of service, brought matters to a crisis.⁵⁴ British

49. Letter No. 1 P, dt. 9th Dec., 1871, from Capt. Bradford to Offg. A.G.G. in Raj., *op. cit.*, NAI.

50. *Ibid.*

51. The other four members of the council were: (1) Chhagmal—Incharge of Civil Court, (2) Jawahermal—Incharge of Criminal Court, (3) Lachmi Chand—Collector, and (4) Treasurer.

52. Kharita of H.H. to A.G.G. in Raj., dt. 3rd Dec., 1871., F. & P. Deptt., March 1872, Nos. 405-431, NAI.

53. Letter No. 146, dt. 8th June, 1872, from Political Officer, Bikaner, to Col. Brooke, A.G.G. in Raj., NAI.

54. F. & P. Deptt., December, 1883, Nos. 20-35, NAI.

forces were sent to suppress the Thakurs' resistance.⁵⁵ This excited the Thakurs particularly Thakur Ram Singh and Bhadur Singh of Bikaner who complained of the oppressive methods adopted by the Maharaja and requested the British Government to remove their forces⁵⁶ from their estates. Later a commission was appointed to enquire into the matter and punishments were inflicted on the Thakurs of Bidasar, Aditpura and Gopalpura. The relations between the Thakurs and the Maharaja deteriorated day by day and complaints were made against the Maharaja by the Thakurs of Bikaner to the British Government⁵⁷ who also encouraged the Thakurs to rise against the Maharaja.⁵⁸ On account of the prevailing unrest and mal-administration in the State a strong warning was issued to the Maharaja to conform to the principles agreed upon in 1883, or else the British Government would have no option but to exercise direct control and intervene in the affairs of the State.⁵⁹ According to the terms agreed upon the Maharaja was required to dismiss those favourites whose presence at Bikaner was considered harmful by the Political Officer and was to conform implicitly to the Political Officer's recommendation regarding the

55. Letter No. 58P, dt. 26th Nov., 1883, from the A.G.G. in Raj. to the Pol. Agent, F. & P. Deptt., Dec., 1883. Nos. 20-35, NAI.

56. Telegram from Thakur Ram Singh and Bahadur Singh of Bikaner, dt. 4th Dec. 1883. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. Agent, Dec., 1883, Nos. 20-35, NAI.

57. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., April, 1879, Nos. 182-205, NAI.

58. An official note was made on the file by the British Government which reads as: "It seems to me a good sign that the people are coming to understand that they can make a fight of it if necessary. No orders seem to be required. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., April, 1879, Nos. 182-205, NAI.

59. "I am now to request you to call upon him (H.H.) for an explanation of his proceedings in this respect. You should at the same time convey to H.H. a clear warning that unless he is ready to act without reserve upon the agreements which were sanctioned in my letter of 31st Dec., 1883, with the object of avoiding more direct interference in the State, it may become necessary to revise those arrangements in a manner likely to be very inpalatable to H.H...." letter No. 3571-I, dt. 6th Oct., 1886, from Secy., G.O.I., to A.G.G. in Raj., NAI.

conduct of administration and the reform of abuses.⁶⁰

Administrative reforms in Bikaner

In 1869, an extradition treaty was concluded between the British Government and Maharaja Sardar Singh of Bikaner State. Accordingly, "any person whether a British or a foreign subject committing a heinous offence in British territory, and seeking shelter within the limits of the Bikaner State was to be apprehended and delivered up" by the Bikaner State on requisition and vice versa.⁶¹

Salt Agreement (1879)

In 1879 the British Government entered into an agreement with the State for the suppression of the manufacture of salt within the State, except at two places. Quantity for export was limited and subjected to the payment of duty. Transit duty on British salt was abolished. The export of bhang, ganja, spirits, opium and other intoxicating drugs were prohibited. In return the British Government agreed to pay to the Ruler Rs. 6,000 a year and to supply to the State 20,000 mds. of salt a year from the salt works at Phalodi and Didwana at a price not exceeding eight annas a maund.⁶² Regardless of the provisions of this treaty the Bikaner State in practice surrendered the right of manufacturing salt within the State.

Railway agreement, Coinage and Postal unity

In 1889, the British Government entered into an agreement with the Maharaja of Bikaner for the construction of Railway lines between Jodhpur and Bikaner. The expenses were to be borne by the two States.⁶³ Later, the jurisdiction

60. D.O. letter No. 32 P, dt. 16th Sept., 1886 from Col. Bradford to Secy., G.O.I. and letter of Secy., G.O.I., dt. 31st Dec., 1883, to the A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Intt.-A., Oct., 1886, Nos. 78-80, NAI.

61. Aitchison: *Engagement, Treaties and Sanads*, Vol. III, pp. 291-93.

62. *Ibid.*, pp. 291-93.

63. *Ibid.*, pp. 296-97.

was extended to Jodhpur-Bikaner, Bikaner-Bhatinda, southern Punjab Railway and meter gauge railway from Balotra to Hyderabad (Sind).⁶⁴ In 1893, under the Native Coinage Act 1876, an agreement took place for supplying to the State from British mint of silver coins bearing on one side the name of the Maharaja, the Maharaja agreed to abstain from minting silver and copper coins in his own mints for a period of 30 years.⁶⁵ In 1903, the Postal unity scheme in the State was introduced by which separate postal system of the State also came to a close.⁶⁶

Reforms in Jodhpur

On 29th December, 1868, Colonel Keating, the A.G.G., proposed an engagement according to which a Ministry was established at Jodhpur. The Ministry was assigned 15 lakhs of rupees per year for conducting public administration. This Ministry had the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the Khalsa land, but the palace limits and Jagirs were not under it. The State Accounts were to be inspected by a person deputed by the A.G.G. in Rajasthan. This was to remain in force for a period of four years unless in the meantime, "a continuance of misrule of the weakness of the Marwar administration forced the GOI to make it interfere."⁶⁷ Like other States in 1868, Jodhpur also accepted the extradition treaty which was slightly modified in 1887.⁶⁸ In 1869, the Maharaja entered into an agreement in connection with the construction of an Imperial Road through the Jodhpur State,⁶⁹ and in 1870, concluded the Salt Treaty according to which the Sambhar Lake along with Nawa and Gurha were leased by the British Government.⁷⁰ In 1879, a salt agreement was concluded for the lease to the Bri-

64. *Report on the Adm. of Bikaner State*, 1912-13.

65. Aitchison: *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 296-97.

66. *Ibid.*, pp. 296-97.

67. *Ibid.*, pp. 141-44.

68. Erskine: *Rajputana Gazetteer*, Vol. III; Aitchison, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, No. X, pp. 139-41.

69. Aitchison, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 145-47.

70. *Ibid.*

tish Government of the four principal Salt sources of Jodhpur. the Salt sources of Didwana, Pachparda, Phalodi and the Luni tract. All other salt sources, except the two of the Pichiak and Malkoni, were suppressed, and the annual turn over from these sources was to be limited to 20,000 maunds.⁷¹

State Administration is handed over to Jaswant Singh

In 1870, for not being allotted proper seat, Maharaja Takht Singh (1843-1873) returned to Jodhpur without attending the Ajmer Darbar, the Governor-General took a serious note of it. Maharaja Takht Singh proceeded⁷² to Abu to discuss administrative measures in the Jodhpur State. The A.G.G. had already suggested that Jaswant Singh⁷³ should be given a larger share in the State administration.⁷⁴ The interview resulted in Maharaja Takht Singh giving a Kharita to the British Government saying that, "he had handed over the entire administration of Marwar to his son and heir Jaswant Singh."⁷⁵ This was evidently the result of Maharaja Takht Singh's behaviour in the Viceroy's Darbar held at Ajmer (1870). Maharaj Kumar Jaswant Singh (1872-1895), tried to put an end to the anarchy and mal-administration in the State. The corrupt officials were punished and reforms and discipline introduced.⁷⁶ In 1872 Maharaj Kumar Zorawar Singh, the second son of Maharaja Takht Singh, took possession of Nagaur by force. The State troops marched towards Nagaur, suppressed the Thakurs and defeated Zorawar Singh who tendered apology and was sent to Ajmer.⁷⁷

The Thakur's Unrest

Jodhpur people were not happy with Maharaja Takht Singh

71. Van Wart: *Life of General Sir Pratap Singh*, p. 39.

72. *Ibid.*

73. The Crown Prince of Jodhpur.

74. Van Wart: *Life of General Sir Pratap Singh*, p. 39.

75. *Ibid.*, p. 40.

76. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

77. J.S.A. Haqiqat Bahi, No. 27, pp. 534, 793.

as well as his successor Pratap.⁷⁸ The reign of Maharaja Jaswant Singh had witnessed an unrest in Jalore district in 1870-80. The Jodhpur Maharaja with the assistance of British forces suppressed the unrest and captured Sadul Singh, the Thakur of Rewara, who was later executed in September, 1882.⁷⁹ The Lohiana State had also been resisting the authority of the Darbar. Ultimately in 1883, Rana Salji of the Lohiana State was captured and Jodhpur Darbar confiscated the estate.⁸⁰ However, the differences between the Maharaja and his Dewan and the Thakurs continued to affect the administration adversely.⁸¹ Under the circumstances, the Maharaja Sir Pratap requested the British Government to assist him in the administration on which the A.G.G. remarked:⁸²

"I found that Thakurs had no real grievances to complain of but they decline to receive orders from any of the brothers of Maharaja...."

Sir Pratap Singh was advised to participate more actively in the State affairs.

Reorganisation of the General-Administration on British pattern

The reign of Maharaja Jaswant Singh is considered as the period of reorientation and modernisation of the State Administration. Due to Sir Pratap's efforts good Government was established and anarchy ended.⁸³ When Mahajara Jaswant Singh succeeded to the throne, the administration was in a disorganised condition. Sir Robert Grosthwoite, the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, while delivering a speech on the occasion of the investiture of Maharaja Jaswant Singh said, "when His Highness's father succeeded to power, the State was disorganised, life and property

78. Aitchison, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 146.

79. Aitchison, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

80. *Ibid.*

81. Letter No. 33, dt. 29th Aug., 1881, from the A.G.G. F. & P. Deptt., A. Pol.—I, Sept., 1882, No. 300, NAI.

82. Letter No. 33, dt. 29th Aug., 1881, *op. cit.*, NAI.

83. Lord Hardinge's speech at the State banquet in Feb., 1914.

were insecure, the finances were in a bad condition, and debts had accumulated. But so ably was the administration conducted that law and order were restored, large sums expended on railway construction and irrigation works, the revenue nearly doubled, and the whole State was placed in a prosperous condition."⁸⁴ In the year 1878, Sir Pratap was appointed chief minister. On 2nd January, 1880, Major Poulett took over Political charge of the Western Rajputana State and with his assistance, Sir Pratap introduced reforms which established good Government in Marwar."

Political Regeneration

The year 1884, in the words of Colonel Erskine, "makes the termination of a period of internal disorder and the commencement of an epoch of political regeneration."⁸⁵ During Maharaja Jaswant Singh's reign dacoities and other violent crimes were successfully suppressed. The introduction of all-embracing codified laws, the re-organisation of the courts of Justice, and the settlement of criminal tribes, the reformation of customs tariff, the constitution of the forest department, the remodelling of the financial system, the adoption of postal unity, the distribution of up to date medical relief and the introduction of a number of other useful reforms were the distinguished features of the administration."

Land Revenue system improved

A village boundary survey of the whole State and a cadastral survey of the Khalsa villages was undertaken in 1883 and completed in 1893, under the supervision of Colonel W. Loch, assisted by Pandit Badhawa Ram, a Revenue Officer from Punjab.⁸⁶ The actual assessment on cash rent basis or 'Bighori' in-

84. *Annual Report of Jodhpur State*, p. 3.

85. Adams: *Western Rajputana States*, p. 54.

86. Erskine: *Rajputana Gazetteer*, Vol. III, A., p. 74.

87. *Annual Adm. Report of Jodhpur State*, 1910-11, p. 2.

88. Adams: *op. cit.*, p. 55.

stead of 'Batai' was done in 1895 by Sir Sukhdeo Prashad.⁸⁹ This settlement was for a period of 10 years only, but, however, before 1922 the second settlement could not take place.⁹⁰

Excise Revenue

Most of the Thakurs and the Jagirdars levied excise taxes for their own benefit, so that there was neither the control on liquor traffic nor was revenue accruing from it collected by the State.⁹¹ To stop this illicit traffic and to check as far as possible the growing drinking habit, as also to ensure unadulterated distillation, the Darbar deemed it advisable to systematize excise operations. A regular system of excise throughout Marwar was introduced in 1887. The State was divided into five circles⁹² (including the city) each under an inspector with a small staff, and a Board of Directors (two for Jagir and one for Khalsa villages), was entrusted the duty of supervising the general working of the department.⁹³ In 1894-95, the excise operations were extended to ganja, bhang and bhang products.⁹⁴ In 1898, licence for the sale of European liquor was first granted.⁹⁵ The name of Queen Victoria replaced that of Shah Alam on the coins struck at the Jodhpur mint in 1898.⁹⁶

Education

Prior to 1868 only vernacular education was imparted in the State by an indigenous system of private *Maktabas*⁹⁷ and *Poshals*⁹⁸ or *Pathashalas*.⁹⁹ The first vernacular school of modern

89. Erksine: *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, A., p. 145.

90. *Annual Adm. Report of Jodhpur State*, 1907-08, p. 14.

91. Vanwart, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

92. *Annual Adm. Report of Jodhpur State*, 1887-88, p. 36.

93. Erskine, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, A., p. 151.

94. *Annual Adm. Report of Jodhpur State*, 1907-08, p. 40.

95. Erskine, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, A., p. 151.

96. Webb: *Currencies of the Hindu States of Rajputana*, p. 41.

97. Maktabas were Muslim institutions.

98. Poshals were Hindi institutions.

99. Erskine, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, A., p. 66.

type was opened in 1868 at Jalor and Barmer in the District of Mallani and was attended by 100 students.¹⁰⁰ Later Anglo-vernacular schools were opened and in 1893 Jaswant College was established and was affiliated to Allahabad University and raised up to the B.A. standard in 1898.

The Jodhpur Walterkrit Rajput Hitkarini Sabha

The JWRH Sabha was the branch of the All Rajputana Sabha established in 1888, under the Presidentship of Colonel Walter, the then A.G.G. in Rajputana. The object of the Sabha was to promote social advancement of the Rajputs and the Charans regulating the expenses in marriages and funeral ceremonies. A contravention of the rules of the Sabha was dealt with by the local committee and was punishable by fine subject to an appeal to the *Ijlas-i-Khas*. There were two funds established by the Sabha, one for its social advancement of the Charan community, and the other for the Rajputs.¹⁰¹

Reforms in Jaipur

Jaipur had also witnessed new changes with the introduction of reforms on British pattern under the efficient guidance of Maharaja Ram Singh (1835-80). The administrative machinery was remodelled and separate departments were created for education, police, medical and health. The State was divided into five parts and each was placed under a Nazim who was initially collector, Judge, district magistrate and police officer.

In 1867, the State council was reconstituted to include eight members as heads of various departments under the supervision of the Maharaja. This was the first body of its kind in Rajputana and the example was followed by other States.¹⁰² The Police code was framed in 1860 and revised in 1873.

The Maharaja took a keen interest in education. The Maharaja's College started in 1844 with forty students and had

100. A.R.J., 1941-42, p. 45.

101. J.S.A. Haquikat Bahi No. 36, p. 224.

102. Marshman, J.C.: *History of India*, p. 311.

eight hundred students in 1875. Maharaja's Sanskrit College was founded in 1845, a Rajput School for Rajput boys in 1861, a girls' High School in 1867, and a school for Arts and Crafts in the same year. To sum up, in the districts at that time there were 33 elementary schools supported by the State and 379 indigenous all more or less supported with an aggregate class attendance of nearly 8,000.¹⁰³

The first State-owned City Hospital started functioning in 1870 and there were 24 dispensaries at the end of Maharaja Ram Singh's reign. The Maharaja also got completed Agra-Ajmer Railway line and installed Telegraph and Postal system in the State in 1864. A Municipal Committee, to look after the capital city, Jaipur, was also appointed in 1868.¹⁰⁴ Thus, due to these reforms, which continued after the Maharaja's death, Jaipur soon became one of the best administered States in India.

Reforms in Kota

After the suppression of the mutineers, when the British troops left the Kota territory, the question of the reorganisation of the administration was a great problem before the Kota Maharao. It was felt that the structure of the whole administration needed to be reorganised.¹⁰⁵ New rules and regulations had already been introduced in the British territories of Delhi and Agra and in some other native States and this greatly enhanced the need to introduce reforms in Kota State too. The British Political Agent had also advised the Maharao to introduce the reforms in the State. In the circumstances Kota Maharao thought it proper to introduce the new reforms in the State.¹⁰⁶

The administration of the State was practically paralysed. Though in principle all the orders of the State were to be issued in the name of Maharao yet in practice the Darbar officials and his favourites used to issue all necessary orders. People were

103. *Government of India Report*, 1875.

104. Marshman, J.C., *op. cit.*, p. 313.

105. Sharma M.L.: *Kota Rajya Ka Itihas*, Vol. II, p. 630.

106. *Ibid.*, p. 631.

denied justice and bribery and corruption were rampant.¹⁰⁷ Recurrence of theft and dacoity posed a great problem to maintaining peace and tranquillity in the State. In short the administration needed a complete overhaul.¹⁰⁸

Thus on the advice of the Political Agent, in 1862, the Maharao of Kota introduced a number of reforms. The State was divided in various districts and district administration was entrusted to a 'Ziladar'. The Police Department was also strengthened and the responsibility of maintaining law and order became primary duty of the 'Kotwal'.¹⁰⁹ Bribery was declared a legal offence and to make the administration efficient office hours were fixed.

In 1874, the British Government apponited Nawab Faiz Ali Khan to look after the administration of the State.¹¹⁰ But soon the Maharao's relation with Faiz Ali Khan became unhappy as the later proved a parallel authority with the Maharao.¹¹¹ In the circumstances Faiz Ali Khan was retired only after two years. Faiz Ali then complained to the British about the mal-administration of the State.¹¹² In spite of this short period Faiz Ali contributed a lot for the improvement in the State administration. He abandoned the 'Tappan Kachari'¹¹³ which resulted in big savings for the State. The Postal system was also introduced under the management of Patel Gajanand and postal-stamp system was enforced to avoid the misuse of postal charges.¹¹⁴ The system of 'Mukate'¹¹⁵ was also systematised. In 1873, a council consisting of three members was organised first time in the State.

107. *Ibid.*, p. 631.

108. *Ibid.*, p. 632.

109. *Ibid.*, p. 633.

110. *Ibid.*, p. 655.

111. F. & P. Deptt., dt. Jany., 1878, Nos. 1-20, Pol. A., NAI.

112. *Ibid.*

113. Sharma, M.L.: *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 659-60.

114. *Ibid.*, p. 661.

115. 'Mukate' was just like a Zamindari which was to be awarded by the Maharao. Sharma, M.L., *op. cit.*, p. 662.

The council was to take the administrative decisions and was responsible for their implementation.¹¹⁶

Social Reforms

During the administration of Nawab Faiz Ali, for the first time a school for boys and girls was opened and an expenditure of Rs. 3,760 on education was sanctioned. In 1872, the first hospital in the State was opened, and a doctor named Kanhiyalal along with a compounder and a dresser, etc., was appointed. This was the first time in the history of the State when State sanctioned the amount for purchasing medicines.¹¹⁷

Ajmer Darbar (1870)

On 22nd October, 1870, Lord Mayo, the Governor-General and Viceroy of India, organised a Darbar of Rajputana chiefs¹¹⁸ at Ajmer which was attended by the Princes of Udaipur, Jodhpur, Bundi, Kota, Kishangarh, Jhalrapatan, Tonk and Shahpura, etc. Lord Mayo addressing the Darbar suggested to the native chiefs:¹¹⁹

“...If we support you in your rights and privileges, you shall also respect the rights and regard the privileges of those who are placed beneath your care. We demand that everywhere throughout the length and breadth of Rajputana, justice and order should prevail, that you should make roads and undertake the construction works of irrigation and encourage education and provide for the relief of the sick....”

Visit of Prince of Wales (1875)

As we have seen earlier the reaction of the native chiefs to the reforms introduced on British-Indian pattern had not been favourable. This had created a tense atmosphere between the

116. Sharma, M.L.: *Op. cit.*, p. 672. The members of the Council were Aap Amar Singh of Palaythe, Aap Krishna Singh of Rajgarh and Pt. Ramdayal.

117. Sharma, M.L.: *Op. cit.*, p. 666.

118. Rajputana Mewar Agency Reports, 1870-71

119. *Rajputana Agency Records*, 1870, No. 12, List II, NAI.

British Government and the native rulers. In order, therefore, to improve relations, the British Government perhaps thought it proper to arrange a visit of the Prince of Wales to India. The British Government tried to capitalise the Prince's visit as much as they could. Firstly, they tried to create a healthy atmosphere and secondly, they demonstrated the paramountcy of their power when a number of Princes waited on the airport to receive the Prince.¹²⁰ The native Princes by presenting themselves at the airport were very much eager to show their loyalty and gratitude towards the British empire.¹²¹

Rao of Kota not invited

Since the murder of Major Burton at Kota the British Government was not happy with the Maharao of Kota. The Kota Maharao requested the British Government to allow him¹²² to come to Agra on the arrival of Prince of Wales, but a decision to this effect that "it was not desirable that Kota Maharao should be invited" was already taken¹²³ and, therefore, the request of the Maharao was turned down intimating him telegraphically that "it is too late to invite His Highness to Agra."¹²⁴

Imperial Assemblage at Delhi (1877) and Native States

On 1st January, 1877, an Imperial Assemblage was held at Delhi to witness the title of "Empress of India" (Kaiser-e-Hind) assumed by Queen Victoria. All the Native Princes were invited

120. Letter No. 4A of 1875 dt. 12th Oct., 1875, from the Offg. A.G.G. to the Secy., G.O.I., Foreign Deptt., Simla, F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., dt. March, 1877, Nos. 105-106, NAI.

121. Kharita from the Maharao of Kota to H.E. the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., dt. March, 1877, Nos. 117-120, NAI.

122. Kharita from the Maharao of Kota to H.E. the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., March, 1877, Nos. 117-120, NAI.

123. Letter No. 9 B of 1875, dt. 31st Dec., 1875, from the A.G.G. in Raj. to the Secy., G.O.I., F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., 1877, Nos. 117-120, NAI.

124. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., March 1877, Nos. 117-120, NAI.

to Delhi to pay their respect to the Empress of India.¹²⁵ Almost all the native Princes expressing their gratitude and loyalty sent Kharitas to the Governor-General and Viceroy of India.¹²⁶ Expressing his loyalty and gratitude on the occasion H. H. the Rana of Dholpur added:

"...The time of its receipt (receipt of invitation) will ever be regarded by me as the most fortunate moment. I am unable adequately to express the satisfaction with which I regard this favour which it has pleased Her Majesty to bestow on the sons of Hind, but it is to me an especial source of gladness, as the chiefs, my ancestors, have for many generations been attached to the British throne by peculiarities of loyalty and affection. May Her Majesty's Empire remain for ever..."

Similar expressions of loyalty and grateful acceptance for attending the Darbar were conveyed by the Maharajas of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Kishangarh, Udaipur and Bikaner and other native rulers.¹²⁷ Public feelings were also expressed with joy in the eve of proclamation of Her Majesty Queen Victoria as Empress of India on 1st January, 1877. A poem was written by Muraridan, Poet Laureate, of Jodhpur on this occasion calling Queen Victoria a Chakarverti Ruler.¹²⁸ The poet observed:

"None has surpassed Ramchandra, the Kings among the Hindus, and Akbar among the Musalmans. Kavi Raja Muraridan says that history reveals that even under their rules, the land was disorder.

But during thy reign (Victoria's reign), the lion and goat drink at the same 'Ghat', the people enjoy prosperity, and the name of adversity has quite disappeared.

Thou art really true King of Kings, Oh! Queen Victoria, such a "Chakravarti" ruler like thee has never ruled over India."

125. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A., Dec., 1877, Nos. 286-496, NAI.

126. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A., Dec., 1877, Nos 496A-546A, NAI.

127. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A., Dec., 1877, Nos. 286-496, NAI.

128. F. & P. Deptt. Pol. A., Dec., 1877, Nos. 286-496, NAI.

Kota Sardars boycotted the occasion

Whereas on the eve of the installation of Queen Victoria as Empress of India celebrations took place in the States of Rajputana¹²⁹ and dances, sports and 'tamashas' of various kinds were organised at Sirohi, Jaisalmer, Banswara, Pratapgarh, Deoli and Ajmer, etc., and fire-works displayed, a Darbar organised by the Maharao of Kota to witness the ceremony was boycotted by the Kota Sardars. The Darbar was fixed for 12 noon but "owing to the late arrival of the Maharao and waiting for some Principal Sardars who absented themselves, it could not take place till some time later."¹³⁰ The Maharao of Kota took a serious note of this conduct of Kota Sardars and the matter was personally discussed¹³¹ by him.

Afghan War (1878-79) and the active Co-operation of Native Princes

We have seen that as throughout the duration of the mutiny, the Native Princes extended full co-operation to the British Government in India so when the Afghan war broke out in 1878 the native Princes in Rajasthan took this an opportunity again to show their loyalty and sympathy towards the British rulers. The Maharaja of Bharatpur felt a "great pleasure in placing the native troops at the disposal of the British Government."¹³² The Maharao of Kota expressed his "anxiety to assist the supreme Government with troops during the Afghan war."¹³³ The Maharaja of Bikaner expressed his hope that the expedition will have every success and a due punishment to the enemies for

129. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A., Dec., 1877, Nos. 288-496, NAI.

130. Letter No. 1, dt. 2nd Jany., 1877, from Capt. H.B. Abbott, Political Supdt. incharge of the Kota State to Maj. C.K.M. Walter, Offg. A.G.G., Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A., Dec., 1877, Nos. 286-496, NAI.

131. *Ibid.*

132. Letter dt. 25th May, 1878, from Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Bharatpur to Maj. E.R.C. Bradford, A.G.G. for Rajputana. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., June, 1878, Nos. 144-45, NAI.

133. Letter No. 307, dt. 30th Nov., 1878, from Maj. P.W. Poulett, Political Agent, Kota, to Lt. A.C. Tabot, First Asstt. A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A., dt. Feb., 1879, Nos. 336-340, NAI.

their hostility towards the British Government and felt great pleasure to place "the troops at the disposal of the Governmnet of India."¹³¹ The Maharaja of Alwar intimated the British Government about the availability of camels for field forces and meanwhile "offered 220 camels and 50 men, the cost of whom will be maintained by the Darbar himself."¹³² He offered 300 infantry and 200 cavalry of whom the charges will be met by the Maharaja himself.¹³³ Maharaja further offered a "force of 300 infantry and 300 cavalry and to bear all charges connected with their maintenance and further training."¹³⁷ Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Bharatpur "in order to punish the insolent chief of Kabul" offered the "services of a Battalion of the troops composed of 400 foot soldiers."¹³⁵ Similarly the other native princes also offered their help. On the successful result of the Kabul campaign, the native chiefs expressed their pleasure and sent a number of letters of congratulations to the British Government. On the eve of concluding a treaty with Kabul by the British Government, Maharana Sajjan Singh of Udaipur announced to celebrate a "Public Darbar", where Royal salutes were fired and illuminations took place in honour of the occasion.¹⁷ The Maharaja of Jaipur sent a telegram conveying his "most loyal and friendly congratulations on this happy event."¹⁴⁰ The Maha-

134. Translation of a Kharita, dt. 26th Nov., 1878, from Maharaja Doongar Singh of Bikaner to Maj. E.R.C. Bradford. NAI.

135. Telegram of 10th Oct, 1878, from the A.G.G. in Raj., to the Secy., G.O.I., No. 367, F. & P., Deptt., S.S. dt. Dec., 1878, Nos. 320-416, NAI.

136. Kharita dt. 19th April 1878, from Maharaja Alwar to the A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., June, 1878, Nos. 126-130, NAI.

137. Kharita dt. 19th April, 1878 from the Maharaja of Alwar to the A.G.G. in Raj., F. & P. Deptt., Pol. B., dt. June 1878, Nos. 126-130, NAI.

138. Kharita, dt. 19th Nov., 1878, from Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Bharatpur to the G.G. and Viceroy of India. F. & P. Deptt., No. 408, S.S. dt. Dec., 1878, Nos. 320-416, NAI.

139. Kharita, dt. 12th June, 1879, from Maharana Sajjan Singh of Udaipur to H.E. the Viceroy and G.G. of India, No. 198, F. & P. Deptt., S.S. dated Sept., 1879, Nos. 179-361, NAI.

140. Telegram dt. 3rd June 1879, from Maharaja of Jaipur to A.C. Lyall, Foreign Secy., Simla. No. 201, F. & P. Deptt., Sept., 1879, *op. cit.*, NAI.

raja of Jodhpur sending his congratulations requested the British Government to convey his "feelings to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and Empress of India."¹⁴¹ The members of the State Council of Kota also expressed their gratitude on the occasion and observed:¹⁴²

"...The people of India are not accustomed to express their feelings in demonstrations, but, considering it a very agreeable duty to show you what we and others feel on the subject, we take this opportunity to assure you that an unqualified pleasure is felt here on the late success of English arms and request liberty to congratulate you for the same....In conclusion we pray for the long life of our Empress and an uninterrupted continuance of English rule in India."

Swami Dayanand and Arya Samaj movement

When the States were reduced to a position of subservience, Swami Dayanand with a mission to do away with social evils and to awaken the masses towards their political rights became an important force to reckon with. In the year 1857, Swami Dayanand began his preaching career from Hardwar where the largest Hindu religious fare of Kumbha was being held. But from 1867 to 1873 Swami Dayanand had to face a violent storm of opposition as the people in the beginning opposed his views on social reforms. But after November, 1873 the public exhibited some response towards him.¹⁴³ This encouraged Swami Dayanand and he began to consider the idea of forming a society so

141. Kharita, dt. 24th June, 1879, from Maharaja of Jodhpur to H.E. the Viceroy and G.G., No. 204, F. & P. Deptt., *op. cit.*, NAI.

142. Aap Amar Singh, Pt. Motilal, Aap Kishan Singh and Pt. Ramdayal, the members of the State Council, sent congratulations to Maj. P.W. Paulett, Political Agent, Kota, praying for "an uninterrupted continuance of English rule" in India, F. & P. Deptt., dt. Sept., 1879, Nos. 179-361, S.S. NAI.

143. In 1873, Swami Dayanand delivered a series of lectures on Vedic Dharma and a large number of people attended the lectures every evening and returned home fully convinced that the Vedic Dharma as preached by Swamiji was the true faith—*vide* a letter of Babu Kedar Nath Chattopadhyaya to B. Debendra Nath Mukhopadhyaya. Sarda, H.B., *Life of Dayanand Saraswati*, p. 99.

that his work be consolidated and carried on. Accordingly, Arya Samaj was founded on 10th April, 1875, at Bombay.¹⁴⁴

Arya Samaj was a movement which was started to raise the patriotic feelings of the citizens and to remove the prevailing social evils from the Hindu-Society. In Rajasthan, branches of Arya Samaj were founded in almost all the important towns between 1880 and 1890. Vedic Yantralaya, a printing press, was also started by Dayanand Saraswati at Allahabad for the publication of the Arya Samaj literature. Later, the Press was shifted to Ajmer and was put under the supervision of Shyamaji Krishna Varma. Another social institution, namely, 'Paropkarini Sabha,' was also established by Swami Dayanand on 27th February, 1883 at Udaipur,¹⁴⁵ for the propagation of Vedic religion the headquarters of which were also shifted to Ajmer later. This Sabha came in form of Swamiji's will. Dayanand Saraswati wrote, "I, Dayanand Saraswati, entrust these 23 persons the sole incharge of my clothes, books, money, yantralaya and write this 'Swikar-Patra' to use the same for altruistic purposes."¹⁴⁶ This body of twenty-three persons consisted of prominent personalities like His Highness of Shahpura, Shyamaji Krishna Varma, Mahadeva Govind Ranade, etc., with His Highness Sajjan Singh, Maharana of Udaipur, as its President.

Swami Dayanand and the Princes of Rajasthan

He was not satisfied by the popularity of his views among the masses only. He believed unless the co-operation of Princes was achieved, it would be difficult to obtain the ultimate goal of 'Swarajya'. Dayanand, therefore, wished that the rulers of the States should be brought into contact with enlightened members of the Sabha.¹⁴⁷ He also wished to engage the Princes of

144. Lekhram, P.: *Life of Maharshi Dayanand* (Urdu), pp. 234-35; *Times of India*, dt. 10th April, 1875.

145. Mukhoupadhyaya, D.N.: *Life of Dayanand Saraswati*, Part II, p. 422.

146. Dayanand Saraswati: *Swikar Patra*, a pamphlet.

147. Vachaspati, Indra Vidya: *Arya Samaj Ka Itihas*, Part I, p. 133.

Rajasthan in public welfare, by improving their character and by making them more conscious of their duties towards their subjects. Accordingly, in June, 1865, the first time, Dayanand visited Rajasthan and stayed at Karauli as a guest of His Highness the Maharaja of Karauli. When in October, 1865, Swamiji visited Jaipur, Thakur Ranjeet Singh of Achrol became his disciple.¹⁴⁸ During his visit to Ajmer in March 1866, Swami Dayanand requested the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to stop cow slaughter. The agitation to stop cow slaughter in Rajasthan became violent and the bungalow of Colonel Tod in Udaipur was badly damaged.¹⁴⁹ On 1st November, 1866, Swami Dayanand attended the Darbar of Lord Lawrance at Agra and then proceeded to Bharatpur, Jaipur, Ajmer and Churu. On the invitation of Raja Govind Singh he visited Banera. Therefrom he went to Chittor where a Darbar was organised by Lord Ripon to confer the title of G.C.S.I. on the Maharana of Udaipur.¹⁵⁰ Maharana Sajjan Singh of Udaipur met him there and requested him to come to Udaipur. In response to the Maharana's call Swami Dayanand visited Udaipur on 11th August, 1882. Swami Dayanand emphasised over the need of adopting Indian culture instead of cultivating the Western outlook. In Udaipur Swami Dayanand also founded the Paropkarini Sabha which later became the trustees after the Swami's death.

Swami Dayanand and Jodhpur

On 1st March, 1883, Swami Dayanand left for Shahpura and from there he reached Jodhpur on 31st May, 1883.¹⁵¹ The younger brother of the Maharaja Jaswant Singh, Sir Pratap was very much influenced by the speeches of Swami Dayanand. He remarked,¹⁵² "...to my mind it was a fortunate thing for India that Swami came to awaken her from her slumber of lethargy."

148. Sarda, H.B.: *Life of Dayanand Saraswati* (1946), p. 43.

149. Mukhoupadhyaya, D.N.: *Swami Dayanand Saraswati Ka Jeevan Charitra*, edited by Pt. Ghasiram, Part II, p. 675.

150. Sarda, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

151. Hakikat Bahi, No. 31, p. 333, Raj. State Archives, Bikaner.

152. Vanwart, R.B.: *The Life of Lt.-Gen. H.H. Sir Pratap Singh*, pp. 193-94.

Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur was also very much influenced by Swami Dayanand's teachings and issued orders to prohibit post-funeral dinners, alcoholic drinks, etc.¹⁵³ In the meantime, poison was given to Sawmi Dayanand by a Muslim woman at Jodhpur. On 16th October, Swami Dayanand left Jodhpur in a critical condition and died at Ajmer on 30th October, 1883.¹⁵⁴

After two months of the Swami's death the first session of the Sabha was held at Ajmer on 28th December, 1883¹⁵⁵ where Govind Mahadeo Ranade realised that Sabha alone would not be able to accomplish much. He, therefore, proposed to establish Arya Prathinidhi Sabha in the provinces and accordingly the Prathinidhi Sabha was established in Punjab on 29th December, 1886¹⁵⁶ and in U.P. and in Rajasthan in 1888.¹⁵⁷ The Arya Samaj workers used to deliver lectures at the various religious fairs like Kumbh, Pushkar,¹⁵⁸ etc. Shri Prem Chand, a noted worker, went to Udaipur and its villages to spread the cause of Vedic religion among the Bhils.¹⁵⁹ Chand Karan Sarda and Man Karan Sarda were among the foremost workers in Rajasthan who devoted their whole life to the Arya Samaj movement. It is interesting to note that where Maharana Sajjan Singh of Udaipur was one of the foremost disciples of Dayanand after his death, his own descendants placed a ban on the Kirtans of Arya Samaj.¹⁶⁰ The Arya Samajists tried for the revocation of the ban

153. Hakikat Bahi, No. 37, pp. 25 and 222. Raj. State Archives.

154. Mukhoupadhyaya, D.N.: *Op. cit.*, Part III, p. 721.

155. *Report of Paropkarini Sabha*, 1883-1926, Vedic Yantra-laya, Ajmer.

156. *Arya Directory*, published by International Arya League. Delhi. p. 47.

157. *Arya Directory*, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

158. *Forty-second Annual Report of Arya Pratinidhi Sabha*, Rajasthan Malwa and Ajmer—1st March, 1931, to 24th Dec., 1931, pp. 12-14.

159. *Ibid.*

160. *Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Annual Reports of Arya Pratinidhi Sabha*, *op. cit.*, 1st January, 1943 to 30th April, 1946, p. 42.

and met the Prime Minister but to no purpose.¹⁶¹

Dayanand's teachings to the Princes and the people of Rajasthan

Swami Dayanand mainly emphasised upon four factors, viz., *Swadharma*, *Swarajya*, *Swadeshi* and *Swabhasa*.¹⁶² He emphasised that a nation cannot make progress unless it follows its own language, religion, and is ruled by its own Government and is otherwise generally self-reliant. He denounced the salt tax even in 1875 which was opposed by Mahatma Gandhi¹⁶³ in 1930. He stressed that a foreign Government, whatever be its merits, cannot make the people happy.

In the first decade of the twentieth century in some parts of India, notably Bengal, the cult of Swadeshi spread fast. Swami Dayanand was perhaps the first prominent leader who supported the cause of Swadeshi clothes. He reproached Udho Singh, son of Thakur Bhopal Singh, for wearing foreign clothes and advised him to put on Swadeshi clothes.¹⁶⁴ Accordingly, the Maharaja of Jodhpur accepted his advice. As H. B. Sarda observes, "Every one in the service of that (Jodhpur) State, from Maharaja down to peons, and the elite of Jodhpur, adopted the Khadi produced in Marwar. Thus long before the cult of Swadeshi spread through Bengal, Marwar had appeared clothed in Khadi."¹⁶⁵ Swamiji appreciated the Europeans who, though living in India for hundred years, did not give up putting on their own style of dress. In his own words, "They (Europeans) have not changed the fashion of their country, but many among you have copied their dress. This shows that you are foolish, while they are wise."¹⁶⁶ He himself refused to take off his turban to enter in an ancient fortress guarded by British Officers and abstained from sight-seeing.¹⁶⁷

161. *Ibid.*

162. *Satyarth Prakash*, Chap. IV.

163. Sarda, H.B.: *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

164. *Ibid.*, p. 235.

165. *Ibid.*, p. 282.

166. *Ibid.*, p. 323.

167. *Satyartha Prakash*, Chap. XI, p. 318.

For the first time Swami Dayanand used the term 'Swarajya' in 1875, and added that after the attainment of Swarajya, India would become rich again.¹⁶⁶ Mrs. A. Besant writes that it was Dayanand who first raised the slogan, 'India is for Indians.'¹⁶⁷ Swami Dayanand knew that the Princely States of India were, more or less, dependent on the paramount power, and he deplored the condition of the States and their chiefs. To put in his own words, "Whatsoever rule is left to them (Aryas), is being crushed under the heel of the foreigner. There are only a few independent States left. When a country falls upon evil days, the natives have to bear untold misery and sufferings."¹⁶⁸ He stressed over the unity of the people and expressed the view that, "Indian rulers should create a common national sentiment and a common faith in their States."¹⁶⁹ Dayanand wanted to write to the various Princes who were scattered and had no unity. In his own words, "I wish to bring the Rajas and the Maharajas into the right path and want to unite the Arya race into one whole."¹⁷⁰ Accordingly, he taught the Maharana of Udaipur, the Manusmriti and the portion of the Mahabharat which treats of politics and the development of man's character. The Maharana followed Swamiji's advice and gave up promiscuity. "He became averse to taking a second wife."¹⁷¹ Similar counsels were also furnished to the Maharaja of Jodhpur and Idar. Swami Dayanand even visited Ajmer to attend the Delhi Darbar on 1st January, 1877.¹⁷² Dayanand's conception of Swarajya was free from all sorts of casteism. He recognised only two communities—Arya and Anarya. Dayanand, accordingly, asks the foreigners, "not to live here as rulers,"¹⁷³ thus raising the slogan 'Quit India' which Gandhiji raised long after.

168. Chamupati, N.A.: *Glimpses of Dayanand*, Ch. XII, p. 88.

169. Mrs. A. Besant: *India: A Nation*, p. 79.

170. *Satyartha Prakash*, Ch. VIII, p. 185.

171. Sarda, H.B.: *Op. cit.*, p. 286.

172. *Ibid.*, p. 240.

173. Sarda, H.B.: *Op. cit.*, p. 284.

174. Mukhoupadhyaya, D.N.: *Op. cit.*, p. 386.

175. *D.S. Aryabhivinaya*, p. 104.

Swami Dayanand also emphasised over the adoption of Hindi as national language. To Swamiji's mind no reform was possible without having one religion and one language. He says, "it is extremely difficult to do with differences in language, religion, education, customs and manners, but without doing that the people can never fully effect mutual good and accomplish their object."¹⁷⁶ Swami Dayanand advised the Maharaja of Jodhpur to teach Devnagari to his son.¹⁷⁷ He also encouraged the people to support the cause of Hindi before Mr. Hunter, the Chairman of Education Commission, appointed by the Government of India.¹⁷⁸

Influence of the Movement

The teachings of Swami Dayanand not only influenced the people of Rajasthan but virtually the whole country. As Pat-tabhai Sitaramayya observes:¹⁷⁹

"The Arya Samaj in the North-West, founded by the venerable Swami Dayanand Saraswati, furnished the necessary corrective to the spirit of heterodoxy and even heresy which the Western learning brought with it....The Arya Samaj movement was aggressive in its patriotic zeal and while holding fast to the cult of the infallibility of the vedas and the superiority of the vedic culture, was at the same time not inimical to broad social reforms." The movement fought some of the prevailing social evils and religious superstitions in Hinduism. The movement was not only a religious or social one but a national movement.

Charles C. Heimsath observed:¹⁸⁰

"In all India sense the Arya Samaja's influence was unobtrusive particularly in the main centres of modern Indian life during the 19th century...the ground work was being laid, how-

176. Speeches of Swami Dayanand.

177. *Narayan Abhinandan Granth*, (1945), p. 157. Publisher: *Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha*.

178. Mukhoupadhyaya, D.N.: *Op. cit.*, Introductory, p. 17.

179. Sitaramayya, P.: *The History of Congress*, Vol. I.

180. Heimsath, Charles, C.: *Nationalism and Hindu Social Reform*, p. 180.

ever, for the most successful unification of religious and social reforms with nationalism that was to be found in pre-Gandhian India."

Thus the Arya Samaj movement played an important role at the time when there was no ray of hope, and the morals of the people had declined considerably. In fact the movement gave confidence to the people which indirectly made the people politically conscious about their rights and duties. The Arya Samaj movement was painfully aware of the fact that the Indian trade was controlled by the foreigners. The movement, therefore, insisted on the adoption of Swadeshi. Swami Dayanand wrote, "what can you expect but misery and poverty when the people of a country trade only among themselves whilst foreigners through their international trade rule over them!"¹⁸¹ Thus the most important contribution of the movement was that it gave a feeling of self-respect to the citizens of the country. As Shyamaji Krishna Varma, a prominent revolutionary and a disciple of Swami Dayanand, said that "of all movements in India for political regeneration of the country none is so potent as proclaimed by its founder is an absolute, free and independent form of national Government."¹⁸² The influence of the movement over the masses was so imminent that it was treated as "serious threat to the British power in India."¹⁸³ The movement preached equal rights to the people which helped in the emergence of political consciousness and awakening among the people to set themselves free from the foreign yoke.

Thus the Arya Samaj, in a way, prepared the ground for the Indian National Congress. Swami Dayanand's teachings produced a teaching of pride for vedic religion, vedic language and other old institutions, ideas and values, of our country. The indirect effect of his teachings was that people became conscious of their great religion and social heritage and this was one of

181. Sarda: *Op. cit.*, p. 197.

182. Quoted from the *Sociologist* by V. Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, p. 110.

183. V. Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, p. 110.

the most potent factors in the general awakening of the Princes and educated middle-class in Rajasthan and elsewhere. Moreover, a careful analysis of various reforms, mentioned above, opened a way to the people to think about their political rights and to establish various organisations which created conditions favourable to the successful development of revolutionary movements in Rajasthan.

CHAPTER IV

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AND RAJASTHAN (1885—1924)

The year 1884, in the words of Colonel Erskine, "marks the termination of a period of internal disorder and the commencement of an epoch of political regeneration." Colonel Erskine was right in a sense when in 1885 a small group of reformers such as A. O. Hume and Dadabhai Naoroji organised the Indian National Congress, destined to become the spearhead of the struggle for independence. In the beginning the Congress demands were limited only to the introduction of administrative reforms in the country and educating public opinion for the struggle that lay ahead.

Unfortunately, the modest aims and objects of the Congress were regarded by the Princes of Rajputana as embodying a distant ideal that seemed quite unattainable then. This is evident from the two letters that were written by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and A. O. Hume to the Maharaja of Jaipur.² With the birth of Indian National Congress, a parallel institution known as 'Indian Patriotic Association' was founded by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Explaining the object of the association Syed Ahmed Khan had written a letter to the Maharaja of Jaipur that the object of the

1. Erskine, K.D.: *Rajputana Gazetteer*, Vol. III, A.P. 74.

2. Letter dated 25th August, 1888 from Syed Ahmed, Hony. Secretary of the Indian Patriotic Association, to H.H. the Maharaja of Jaipur. F. & P. dt. 1st Jany., 1889, Nos. 3-4, S.C. NAI.

association was to make it clear to the members of the British Parliament, English Journals and the people of Great Britain, that "all the nations of India, and the Indian Chiefs and rulers do not agree with the aims and objects of the National Congress."³ It was further added that the association will work 'to preserve peace in India' and 'to strengthen the British rule' and 'to remove those bad feelings from the hearts of the Indian people which the supporters of the Congress are stirring up throughout the country' and 'by which great dissatisfaction is being raised among the people against the British Government.'

But Mr. A. O. Hume⁴ had also addressed a letter to His Highness the Maharaja of Jaipur, contradicting the contents of Sir Syed's letter and emphasising that the real objects of the Indian National Congress were "to consolidate British rule, to enhance the prosperity alike of the Princes amongst the members of all the many races, castes and creeds that inhabit this vast Empire."⁵ Maharaja of Jaipur, however, did not take notice of either of these letters, as "he did not wish to be dragged into unprofitable discussion."

Congress Committee founded in Ajmer

But just two years after the death of Maharshi Dayanand in Ajmer and three sessions held at Bombay, Calcutta and Madras in 1885, 1886 and 1887 respectively, the message of the Congress reached Ajmer and a Congress Committee was formed by some students of Government College.⁶ The first representa-

3. Letter dt. 25th August, 1888, from Syed Ahmed to Maharaja of Jaipur, *op. cit.*, NAI.

4. Letter dt. 25th August, 1888, from Syed Ahmed to Maharaja of Jaipur, *op. cit.*, NAI.

5. Mr. Hume was the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress.

6. Letter from Hume addressed to H.H. the Maharaja of Jaipur. Diary of the Residency at Jaipur, No. 4, Special Branch, F. & P. Deptt., 1st Jany., 1889, Nos. 3-4, Secret, NAI.

7. Remarks of H.P. Peacock, Offg. Resident, Jaipur, F. & P. Deptt., 1st Jany., 1889, Nos. 3-4, Secret, NAI.

8. The members of the committee were Ram Gopal Kayastha, Fateh Chand Khubiya and Harbilas Sarda, Deepak, Jagdish Prashad: *Reverged in London*.

tion of Ajmer in Indian National Congress was made by Gopinath Mathur and Kishan Lal in its fourth session held at Prayag (Allahabad) in 1888 under the Presidentship of Mr. George Yule.⁹ The session was attended by Harbilas Sarda also.¹⁰

Birth of Journalism in Rajasthan and their Impact

Then attempts on the part of the nationalists got momentum by the introduction of the activities of the press. This was the time when journalism also took its birth in Udaipur and the first periodical named 'Sajjan Kirti Sudhakar' on the name of the then Maharaja Sajjan Singh appeared.¹¹ In Ajmer the first issue of the 'Rajasthan Times', an English Weekly, was published on Thursday the 8th August, 1885.¹² The objects of the paper as explained in its editorial¹³ were:

"...to bring abuses wherever they exist to the notice of the authorities with the object that they may be set right with an attitude of an impartial Judge." Simultaneously a Hindi edition of the said paper was started under the title 'Rajasthan Patrika'. It is creditable that these two journals had a vigorous tone even in those days which is illustrated by the editorial comment of the 'Rajasthan Times' on the alleged injustice done to the Maharaja Zalim Singh of Jhalawar. The paper wrote,¹⁴ "now the Government is bent upon oppressing the people. The Government is hereby informed that the continuance of such things will lead to a terrible and harmful result."

The publication of both these papers was closed when a member of Jaipur Regency Council filed a suit against its editor, Bakshi Laxmandas, for libel. The editor was sentenced to imprisonment for a year and half.¹⁵

9. U.C. Bhattacharya's note on the History of Freedom Movement in Ajmer, vide *Revenged in London*.

10. Har Prasad: *Azadi Ke Diwane*, p. 122.

11. Deepak, Jagdish Chandra: *Revenged in London*.

12. *Ibid*.

13. *Rajputana Times*, dated 8th August, 1885.

14. *Rajasthan Patrika*, dated 12th August, 1885.

15. Deepak, *Revenged in London*.

The next bolder venture in Hindi journalism came at the close of ten years, when in 1889, Munshi Samrathdan Charan¹⁶ founded the daily 'Rajasthan Samachar' with a printing press under his own editorship.¹⁷ The circulation of the paper increased so rapidly that the news of the Tunisian war published by it reached Mount Abu fourteen hours before the "PIONEER".¹⁸

Thus the establishment of a number of printing presses and publication of a number of local daily newspapers gave an impetus to the spread of radical ideas. In the beginning of the 20th Century, Ajmer, therefore, became the centre of all progressive ideas for the whole of Rajasthan and central India. These ideas, in course of time, spread over entire Rajasthan. From then people in Rajasthan looked to Ajmer for political guidance.

Murder of Commissioner Rand and the involvement of Shyamaji Krishna Varma

Thus when love for Nationalism was gaining ground in the country, in the year 1897, in Maharashtra, Commissioner Rand and Lt. Ayrest were shot dead while they were coming out from a native hut. It was believed that Shyamaji was connected with the murder.¹⁹ But somehow he managed to sail off to England where he organised India House activities in 1905,²⁰ as a result of which one of his disciples Madan Lal Dhingra shot dead Currzon Willy in London on 1st July, 1909.²¹

Shyamaji Krishna Varma was a disciple of Swami Dayanand Saraswati. After obtaining the Bachelor's Degree of the Oxford University he started legal practice in Ajmer. He was

16. Samrathdan Charan was disciple of Swami Dayanand.

17. F. & P. Dept., dt. Nov., 1889, Nos. 109-110, Intd. B. NAI.

18. *Maharishi Dayanand's Life Sketch*, pp. 505-506.

19. *Sedition Committee Report*, pp. 4-5.

20. In England, he published a monthly Journal called 'Indian Sociologist' and 'India Home Rule League' and awarded three scholarships (which were named after Herbert Spencer, Rana Pratap and Swami Dayanand) to those Indian students who intended to continue studies in England and had sympathy with the Indian national movement.

21. Deepak, Jagdish Chandra: *Revenged in London*, pp. 31-32.

a staunch supporter of Swadeshi and in collaboration with Seth Damodar Dass Rathi, he started a textile mill at Beawar to popularise Swadeshi goods.²² Later he was appointed a member of the Udaipur Council and Dewan of the State.²³ During his stay at Udaipur, the British Resident tried to persuade the Maharana to get rid of Shyamaji but to no avail.²⁴ Thus Shyamaji, by his teachings, prepared the ground for the forthcoming revolutionaries in Rajasthan.

Swadeshi Movement in Rajasthan

Along with these activities the Swadeshi movement was also endeavouring to awaken the masses in the last quarter of the 19th century. Swami Dayanand Saraswati was the first social worker who, long before, stressed over the assumption of 'Swadeshi'. Later the same was taken up by the Bengali nationalists. In Rajasthan the first signs of Swadeshi movement appeared in Banswara, Sirohi, Mewar and Dungarpur, where the people had organised themselves under the leadership of Swami Govind Giri, who was the moving spirit behind this organisation. In this regard Sirohi led the agitators and a Sampa Sabha was established to represent the grievances of the people before the British Government.²⁵ Under the leadership of Govind Giri people boycotted the foreign goods and used Swadeshi goods only. Swami Govind Giri asked the people to give up the use of intoxicating drugs also. Thus the Sampa Sabha started to assume a political character and this alarmed the British Government. Accordingly by an order of the British Government the Sabha was disbanded in 1908,²⁶ and the rulers were asked to check the Swadeshi movement as the British Government regarded it as 'an act of sedition.'²⁷ Thus due to the heavy repressive policy of the Government the Swadeshi movement died an early death.

22. Yagnik, Inder Lal: *Shyamaji Krishna Varma, Life and Times of an Indian Revolutionary*, p. 63.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 82.

25. Gehlot, J.S., *Rajasthan Ka Itihas*, Vol. III, p. 92.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Marwari*, Dec., 1, 1909.

Delhi Darbar (1903)

Finding that the political atmosphere of the country was changing very fast and anti-British sentiments were emerging rapidly, Lord Curzon tried to obtain the co-operation of the Indian Princes in order to stem the tide of revolutionary activities. With this end in view Lord Curzon, the Governor-General and Viceroy of India, invited all the native chiefs to attend the Delhi Darbar on 1st January, 1903.²⁸ The invitation was warmly received by the native chiefs of Rajasthan expressing their feelings of loyalty to the British throne. The Maharajas of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Kishangarh, Sirohi, Kota, Bikaner, etc., fully appreciated the opportunity accorded to them to testify their loyalty to the throne and expressed their joy and gratitude on being invited.²⁹ But the invitation was received coolly by Maharana Fateh Singh of Udaipur (Mewar). The Maharana, however, agreed³⁰ to attend the Darbar provided he be given a first position in order of precedence among all the ruling Princes of India and it seems that Maharana was assured that "the due consideration would be given to his dignity."³¹

But the general opinion of the nobles and the people in the State was against the Maharana's decision. The Maharana was made to feel that it was derogatory to his dignity and status to attend the Darbar, and would impair the prestige, which he enjoyed among the Rajputs and the Hindus of India. When he started for Delhi, his court poet, Barhat Kesri Singh, composed a poem which was given to him while on his way to Delhi. The poet reminded the Maharana of the glorious and heroic traditions of his ancestors, who never submitted to any power nor

28. Letter dated 19th March, 1902 from the Governor-General and Viceroy to all the Native Chiefs. Wheeler, Stephen: *Delhi Coronation Darbar*, p. 11. Abu Collection, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

29. The Maharaja of Kishangarh sending a Kharita to Viceroy ended his letter with this hattering appeal, 'O God, may the whole universe, from the Zenith to the Nadir, remain under His Excellency's control and command'. Wheeler, Stephen: *Op. cit.*, pp. 13-17.

30. F. & P. dt. May, 1912, Nos. 11-15, S.C. NAI.

31. F. & P. Deptt., dt. May 1912, Nos. 11-15, S.C. NAI.

paid 'Nazar' to any one but carried on constant struggle to uphold their name and fame. It appears that the poem created a deep impression on Maharana's mind and he decided not to attend the Darbar.³² Maharana reached Delhi on 31st December, 1902, and came to know that he had been assigned a place below the rulers of Hyderabad, Baroda, Mysore and Kashmir, which was contrary to the assurance given to him.³³ He, therefore, did not leave his railway carriage and pretended that "he and his son had fallen ill due to the exertion of journey." He informed Lord Curzon that "it would not be possible for him to attend the reception of the Duke and the Darbar as he was not feeling well." But the Maharana's explanation did not carry conviction with the Viceroy. He, however, could not be persuaded to leave the carriage and to the extreme vexation of the Governor-General of India, "Maharana left for Udaipur even before the first ceremony of the State entry was performed."³⁴

But the rejoicings and enthusiasm shown by the Princes ran contrary to popular feelings. In fact, the opening of the hostilities between Russia and Japan at the Russo-Japanese war in 1904-05 and the consequent defeat of Russia gave birth to a new political thinking in the country. The new thinking and new ideas tended to overthrow the established power of the British and to press the Government for practical reforms. This kind of tendency for change and reform was influenced by the writers of the time. Bankim Chandra was the greatest name in the revolutionary literature of the late 19th century. His works like 'Anandmatha' and 'Kapal Kundala' inspired the Bengali revolutionaries in particular and Indian revolutionaries in general. With dislike for the existing order, and with passionate hope and belief in the possibility of the regeneration of India, this kind of literature also exercised an influence upon the minds and actions of men in Rajasthan. Shri Chandra Dhar Sharma 'Guleri', a patriotic poet of Jaipur, wrote a poem which was published in

32. The poem bore the caption 'Chetawni ra Chungtia' (Urges to awake).

33. F. & P. Deptt., dt. May, 1912, Nos. 11-15, S.C. NAI.

34. *Ibid.*

a monthly Journal 'Deshopakarak' of Seth Ram Dayal Navetia of Fatchpur in Shekhawati."

Partition of Bengal (1905)

Thus when the terrorist movement in Bengal had become a source of inspiration for the other revolutionaries, Lord Curzon, the Governor-General of India, in order to suppress these activities completely divided Bengal into two parts.³⁵ But the partition of Bengal struck enraged the people of Bengal and saddened the Indian people. Slogans and war-cries rang throughout the country and roused the people to fight grimly. Bande Matram, or 'Hail to Mother' acquired a new significance and came to be used as the 'Political war cry of Indian nationalism'. The decision of the partition of Bengal was vehemently opposed by the Indian National Congress as this was to 'seriously interfere with its social, intellectual and material progress, involving the loss of various constitutional and other rights and privileges,'³⁶ and protested against the repressive measures adopted by the authorities in Bengal."

Precautionary measures adopted in Rajasthan by the native rulers against sedition

The ideas which the revolutionaries spread tended to subvert the existing order in British India and in every native State. With a view to curbing their activities, the native rulers were advised to take necessary steps to prevent the seditious meetings, the infiltration of 'revolutionary literature' and 'explosive material' into their States.³⁷ In 1909, Lord Minto, the Governor-General and Viceroy of India, addressed almost all the ruling

35. Chowdhary, Ram Narain: *Partman Rajasthan*, p. 14.

36. Lord Curzon had announced the partition of Bengal on 16th Oct., 1905, as a measure of administrative convenience. But this infused the feelings of the people which led to a fierce agitation in the country.

37. Resolution No. XIV, 20th Session (1904), Indian National Congress, Bombay.

38. Resolution No. XIII, 21st session (1905), Indian National Congress, Banaras.

39. Home-Poll-Deposit, Oct., 1909, No. 16, NAI.

chiefs, viz., of Hyderabad, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Udaipur, Bikaner, Alwar and Dholpur, etc., stating that "the time has come when we may advantageously concert measures and prepare a policy to exclude effectively seditious agitation."⁴⁰ To this call the native chiefs replied enthusiastically. The Maharao of Kota,⁴¹ Bundi, and the Maharajas of Kishangarh, Jaipur, Alwar, Bharatpur, and Bikaner⁴² assured the British Government of their utmost co-operation. The Maharaja of Bikaner further demanded "to put a muzzle on that portion of the venomous press in India which does so much harm and which to a great extent is responsible for all the serious unrest and violent crimes in India."⁴³ In combating with the seditious propaganda the Maharaja suggested that instead of "merely acting on the defensive we should embark on an offensive campaign by way of going about British India addressing audiences, speaking to the people, etc., and by all other means attempt to destroy the seeds of poison sown by seditionists and agitators and to counteract their baneful influence."⁴⁴

Thus to prevent the wave of terrorist movement in Rajasthan, the chiefs of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner, Kota, Udaipur, Bundi, Kishangarh and others issued various proclamations, notifications and Acts preventing 'sedition and anarchism' in their States.⁴⁵ In 1908, Maharaja of Bikaner enforcing the Explosive Act,⁴⁶ prohibited the entry of Subedar Sabal Singh, Recruiting Officer, 104th Rifles in Bikaner, in the Bikaner territory and simultaneously warned the other States too.⁴⁷ In the same

40. Letter dated 6th August, 1909, from Lord Minto to the Native Chiefs. Foreign Deptt., Abu Collection, Univ., of Raj., Jaipur.

41. Letter dt. 28th August 1909, from Maharao of Kota to Viceroy, Foreign Deptt., Abu Collection.

42. Letter dt. 29th Dec., 1909, from the Maharaja of Bikaner to the Viceroy. Foreign Deptt., Abu Collection.

43. Letter dt. 29th Dec., 1909, *op. cit.*, Abu Collection.

44. *Ibid.*

45. F. & P. Deptt., Int.; Feb., 1910, Nos. 24-30, Part A, NAI; Home. Pol. Deposit., Oct., 1909, No. 16, NAI.

46. Home. Pol. Deposit., Oct., 1909, No. 16, NAI.

47. F. & P. Notes, Int. Dec., 1909, No. 40, NAI.

year Tonk Newspaper and Explosive Substances Regulations were enforced and a ban was imposed on the seditious meetings in Sirohi.⁴⁸ In 1909, a proclamation was issued by the Maharaja of Jaipur preventing the seditious activities in the State.⁴⁹ Similarly, the other States like Dholpur, Dungarpur, Karauli, Jhalawar and Shahpura also enforced such acts to prevent the seditious meetings and literature in their States.⁵⁰

A notification⁵¹ was issued by the Jaipur Durbar prohibiting the circulation of certain nationalist newspapers like that of Karam Yogin, Amrit Bazar Patrika, Rashtramat, Kal Kesari and Zamindar, etc., and their entry into the State.⁵² The main reason of suppressing these newspapers was that they were bitterly attacking the repressive policy of the State.⁵³ A number of newspapers which were carrying seditious literature were intercepted at Jodhpur.⁵⁴ It is interesting to note that even the Arya Samaj literature was banned and persons carrying such literature were ordered to be arrested.⁵⁵ Certain other publications carrying anti-British propaganda were proscribed by the order of the Jaipur Darbar.⁵⁶

In this context it is significant that one Miss Perin A.D. Naroji, a friend of anti-British extremist in Paris, had requested for an appointment in the Bikaner State, but her request was not only refused by the Maharaja of Bikaner but even precautionary measures were adopted to prevent her employment in the other States of Rajasthan.⁵⁷ Besides, some other special measures

48. Home. Pol. Deposit, Oct., 1909, No. 16, NAI.

49. F. & P. Notes, Int. July, 1909, Nos. 166-173, NAI.

50. F. & P. Notes, Int., Feb., 1910, Nos. 24-30, Part A, NAI.

51. Home, Pol., B, Feb., 1910, No. B, NAI.

52. F. & P. Int., March, 1910; Nos. 82-87, Part A; NAI; Home Pol., B, Feb., 1910, No. 13, NAI.

53. F. & P. Int., March, 1910; Nos. 82-83; Part A; NAI.

54. F. & P. Secret, I, March, 1910; No. 62, Part A, NAI.

55. F. & P. Secret, March; 1910; No. 82-87, Part A; NAI.

56. F. & P. Secret, I, August, 1910, Nos. 46-50, NAI.

57. F. & P. Int., June, 1911, No. 48, NAI.

were adopted by the native States to prevent and suppress the seditious activities in Rajasthan.⁵⁸ Thus the preaching and publication of sedition against the British was prohibited and any attempt to incite disloyalty towards the British was declared an 'offence'.

Attitude of Maharaja Alwar

In this context, the attitude adopted by Maharaja Jai Singh Deo of Alwar is worth noting. It appears that he was not prepared to accept Britain as a supreme power and was not happy with the continuance of British rule in India. The Maharaja even suggested to the British Government that "during the visit of His Excellency the Viceroy to the Alwar State at the Palace, where His Excellency will reside, the flag of his State should fly."⁵⁹ It was reported that the Maharaja declined to lower down his flag to half mast on the occasion of the death of His Majesty King Edward VII.⁶⁰ Later an enquiry was conducted "against the attitude and tendencies of the Maharaja Alwar."⁶¹ These were the reasons that the British Government discouraged the Englishmen for coming out in India for service under the Alwar Darbar.⁶²

Revolutionary activities in Rajasthan

But the proclamations and notifications issued by the native States could not prevent the seditious and revolutionary activities in Rajasthan. The nationalist newspapers continued to attack on the repressive policy of the States.⁶³ The Indian Musalmans

58. For instance to suppress the seditious activities special staff was recruited in Jaipur. The Jaipur Darbar called Sardar Bishan Singh, Dy. S.P. Punjab, specially for the purpose, F. & P. Deptt., Secret, I; March, 1916; Nos. 7-11, NAI.

59. F. & P. Deptt., Notes, Sec. I, April, 1909, 5. 27, Part A; NAI.

60. F. & P. Deptt., Appendix II, to Notes, Secret, I, March, 1912, Nos. 1-12, NAI.

61. F. & P. Deptt., Appendix II, Nos. 1-12, *op. cit.*, NAI.

62. F. & P. Deptt., Est., Feb., 1916, 161-162; Part B; NAI.

63. F. & P. Deptt., Int., May, 1913, Nos. 160-161, NAI.

were also thinking in terms of starting anti-British activities. For instance, a translation of an Urdu pamphlet was sent from Shanghai to Mohammedans in all parts of India inciting them against British in India.⁶⁴

At this time various revolutionary groups of Northern India were in close contact with each other along with the group of revolutionaries in Rajasthan. In Rajasthan three groups were functioning: one under Arjun Lal Sethi operating from Jaipur, second, under Kesri Singh Bharhat of Kota and third, under Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa and Damodardass Rathi from Ajmer⁶⁵

Arjun Lal Sethi and his revolutionary group

Due to the prohibitive regularities atmosphere in Jaipur was extremely suffocating and there was no room to express one's ideas. Even the students were not to be permitted to stage any drama without obtaining previous permission of the State.⁶⁶ In this atmosphere, Arjun Lal Sethi⁶⁷ and his revolutionary group was planning to protest against the British. Sethi's institution was attended by a number of revolutionaries who came from the different parts of the country.⁶⁸

64. *Ibid.*

65. Choudhry, Ram Narain: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 25-27.

66. The students of a Jaipur school wanted to stage a drama namely 'Neki-Badi', but permission was not accorded. Choudhary, R.N.: *Op. cit.*

67. Arjun Lal Sethi son of Late Jawaharlal was a graduate of Allahabad and had a good command over English, Hindi and Persian. He started a school named Jain Vardhman Pathshala and a hostel at Ghat-Ke-Balaji at Jaipur which soon became the centre of seditious instruction. (Home. Pol., A., June, 1918, Nos. 281-307, and K. W., NAI). One Seth Kalyan Mal used to assist these institutions financially. During the last days of 1911 or 1912, a part of the hostel was shifted to the house of Gulabchand Badla, where young men were trained under the guidance of a Sikh gentleman. The school was finally closed in Dec., 1913, when Arjun Lal Sethi proceeded to Indore and arranged to open a school there with the financial help of a local merchant. (Home. Pol., A., June, 1918, Nos. 281-307, and K.W., NAI.).

68. Choudhary, Ram Narain: *Vartman Rajasthan*, p. 21. Ram Narain Choudhary had visited Sethi's school in July, 1913, to seek an admission for his younger brother Jugal Kishore, where he saw that a boy of five or six years was singing a song 'Swadeshi Ka Baje Danka'.

Arjun Lal Sethi was first noticed as a revolutionary suspect in February, 1914, when a mysterious Hindi letter addressed from Indore to Amir Chand (sentenced to death in the Delhi conspiracy case) was intercepted.⁶⁹ Further enquiries made in this connection revealed that a young man named Sheo Narain had been associated with Arjun Lal Sethi as a teacher in the Jaipur School and had accompanied him to Indore. This was disclosed by Sheo Narain that the Jaipur School of which Arjun Lal was the recognised head was both political and educational and that its political goal was the attainment of 'Swaraj'.⁷⁰ Arjun Lal Sethi was of the view that in order to raise funds for political ends, the commission of dacoities and murders was legitimate. Later, a murder was committed by this group, known as Arrah murder case or 'Nimej murder case'.⁷¹

An account of the Jaipur school of Arjun Lal Sethi as given in the Intelligence Reports of the Government of India reads:⁷²

"Enquiry into the antecedents of the student Chotelal, who is now under trial in the Delhi conspiracy case, has led to the discovery of a political association at Jaipur, which aims at establishing 'Swaraj' in the country by means of the secret societies. This association was formed in 1906 in the guise of an educational samiti, known as the All-India Jain Educational Society, by an individual named Arjun Lal who appears to hold a position of some importance in the Jain world. At the same time Arjun Lal opened a school and hostel at Jaipur, all three institutions are being supported by public subscription. As far as has been ascertained, political work has been going on side by side with religious instruction. Arjun Lal by his preaching attracted a number of youths to his school from time to time whom he utilised as preachers, undertaking in return to maintain them and give them further instruction...."

69. Home. Pol., A, June, 1918. Nos. 281-307, and K.W., NAI.

70. *Ibid.*

71. *Ibid.*

72. Home; Pol., B, May, 1914, Nos. 127-140, NAI.

Thus Arjun Lal Sethi's school became the centre of revolutionary activities in Rajasthan, where the workers were to be trained for the terrorist activities. A group of revolutionaries some of whom were attached to Sethi's school planned a murder of a Mahant.

Nimej Murder Case

On 20th March, 1913, the Nimej murder was committed by one Vishnudutta⁷¹ along with three boys of Arjun Lal Sethi's school somewhere near Mughal Sarai (in Shahabad District) in which the lives of a Mahant and his boy servant were taken.⁷² To get some money for the attainment of 'Swaraj', Vishnudutt, Manak Chand,⁷³ Moti Chand, Jorawar Singh and Jai Chand⁷⁴ prepared a plan and under the guidance of Vishnudutt the party left for Benaras where it was joined by Zorawar Singh. They murdered the Mahant and his boy servant but could not secure any cash except a time piece and a drinking pot⁷⁵ and returned to Sethi's school empty-handed.⁷⁶ In fact in this Nimej Murder case the master-mind which planned the conspiracy was that of Arjun Lal Sethi. This fact is corroborated by the statement of Vishnudutt who accepted that 'Arjun Lal Sethi paid the part of the travelling expenses of the party that set out to execute the crime.'⁷⁷

73. He was a student of Mirzapur District and had visited the school of Arjun Lal Sethi with the object of teaching revolutionary ideas.

74. Statement of Prosecution witness No. 197, Manak Chand in Delhi conspiracy case, Home, Pol., A, July, 1914, Nos. 1-2, NAI.

75. During the trial Manak Chand turned approver and obtained pardon.

76. Statement of Prosecution witness No. 197, *op. cit.*, NAI. Vishnudutt was a close friend of Arjun Lal Sethi, *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 128.

77. *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 128.

78. Home, Pol., A, June, 1918, Nos. 281-307; and K. W., NAI.

79. *Ibid.*

Conviction of Motichand and Vishnudutt

The whole story of the Nimej murder case was disclosed by Sheo Narain who became an approver and made a statement before the police which led to the trial of the Nimej murder case.⁸⁰ Sheo Narain confessed in his statement given before the police that the object of the revolutionary group of Rajasthan was to form 'secret societies' for the establishment of 'Swaraj' and money was to be obtained for this purpose even by the commission of murders.⁸¹ After trial Vishnudutt was sentenced to transportation while Motichand was sentenced to death.⁸²

Delhi Conspiracy Case

Another important factor which came to light during the Delhi conspiracy trial was that Arjun Lal Sethi was also involved in 'Hardinge-Bomb' case though Arjun Lal Sethi and Hariram Sethi were not arrested as the "prosecution did not consider that there was sufficient evidence against them to justify such action"⁸³ though their names were included in the list of suspects in accordance with procedure followed in the Howrah-Bomb trial before the Chief Justice of Bengal.⁸⁴ During the trial one more important factor which was disclosed was that Lala Amirchand, a Delhi revolutionary, was closely associated with Arjun Lal Sethi and Kesri Singh Barhat and Amirchand had visited the school of Arjun Lal Sethi.⁸⁵ During the trial it was also disclosed that when the 'Delhi-Bomb' conspiracy was being planned, in the house of Abod Behari⁸⁶ there was also

80. *Ibid.*

81. Home, Pol., B, May, 1914, Nos. 137-140, NAI.

82. Home, Pol., A; June, 1918; Nos. 181-307, and K.W., NAI.

83. Judgment in the Delhi Conspiracy Case, Home, Pol., A, June, 1918, Nos. 281-307, and K. W., NAI.

84. *Ibid.*

85. Home, Pol., A, July, 1914, Nos. 1-2, NAI.

86. Abodh Behari son of Gobindlal Kayastha of Delhi was one among the eleven accused facing trial in Delhi conspiracy case.

present a youth of 19 years named Ram Lal," who was engaged in studying Sawarkar's book 'War of Independence' and a proscribed work on Arbindo Ghosh. Ram Lal, alias Chotey Lal Jain, was separated away from Abodh's house by Arjun Lal Sethi. Thus, Arjun Lal Sethi was in close touch with Amirchand. The British Government, therefore, during the search, reached the conclusion that the "youth (Ram Lal alias Cheoty Lal Jain) was undoubtedly planted in Delhi for some political purpose, and he was being fed on extremely inflammatory matter, probably with a view to bringing him up as the perpetrator of some future political outrage."⁸⁷ During the investigation, the police charged that there is evidence against Chotey Lal alias Ram Lal "of his having left home under suspicious circumstances and of his passing himself off in Delhi under an assumed name, also of the fact that he was keenly interested in revolutionary politics, that he was associated with Amirchand and Abodh Behari and that he was to bring a hand-bag (probably containing a bomb) to Ras Behari Bose at Saharanpur."⁸⁸ Thus he was charged under Section 302, Indian Penal Code; 120(B), Indian Penal Code; and 4, 5 and 6 of the Act VI of 1908 and was arrested with Lala Amirchand in connection with the Delhi conspiracy case.

Arrest of Arjun Lal Sethi

Though there was no direct evidence of the involvement of Arjun Lal Sethi either in the Delhi conspiracy case or in Nimej murder case, Sethi was kept under custody for some time in Indore Jail and afterwards was sent to Jaipur. On 5th December, 1914, Arjun Lal Sethi was sentenced to five years' imprisonment without trial by the Jaipur Darbar on the allega-

87. His real name was Choteylal. In fact he was taken to Delhi by Lala Amirchand for revolutionary training. He belonged to a Jain community of Jaipur and was highly influenced by the teachings of Arjun Lal Sethi. Home, Pol., A, July, 1914, Nos. 1-2, NAI.

88. Home, Pol., A, July, 1914, Nos. 1-2, NAI.

89. *Ibid.*

tion that he was "concerned in political conspiracies and was dangerous to the public peace and likely to be so in the future also."⁹⁰ To avoid untoward incidents the Maharaja of Jaipur requested the British Government to transfer Arjun Lal Sethi from the Jaipur State and to confine him elsewhere. Accordingly, the British Government issued a warrant under Regulation III of 1818 and Sethi was sent to the Vellore Jail in the Madras Presidency.⁹¹ This created an uproar in the country and many national leaders, associations and newspapers condemned the action of the Jaipur State.⁹² 'Modern Review'⁹³ and 'Amrit Bazar Patrika'⁹⁴ publicly criticised the repressive policy of Jaipur State and demanded the release of Sethi. All India National Congress in its Calcutta session expressed the concern over the detention of Arjun Lal Sethi and asked the Government to concede his demands.⁹⁵ Arjun Lal Sethi repeatedly requested the British Government to release him and was ready to give an undertaking that "he will prove himself loyal to the British King."⁹⁶ He even suggested that having an 'influence in Jain community, he will be able to collect a huge amount of money for the welfare of British Empire.'⁹⁷ Later, however, Arjun Lal Sethi was released in 1920 under the general amnesty granted to the prisoners on the condition that he will not enter in the Jaipur State territory without the previous consent of the Maharaja of Jaipur.⁹⁸ As a result of his long imprisonment he could

90. Home, Pol., A, June, 1918, Nos. 281-307, and K. W., NAI.

91. Letter dt. 7th July, 1918, from Ajit Prasad Jain, Secretary Jain Political Conference to the Private Secretary to the Secretary of State for India. Home, Pol., A, June, 1918, Nos. 281-307, and K.W., NAI.

92. *New India*, dt. 2nd Feb., 1915.

93. *Modern Review*, dt. 15th March, 1915.

94. *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, dt. 10 Feb., 1915.

95. Sitaramayya, P., *History of Congress* (Hindi edition) p. 136.

96. Memorial dt. Nil from Arjun Lal Sethi to H. E. the Governor-General and Viceroy of India, Home, Pol., A, June, 1918, Nos. 281-307, and K.W., NAI.

97. *Ibid.*

98. Telegram No. 140, dt. 16th Jany., 1920, from the Secy. to the Government of India to the Secretary to the Government of Madras. Home, Pol., A, Jany., 1920, Nos. 318A-328, NAI.

not get, even after his release, respect from the Jain community and out of sheer frustration he embraced Islam and later died in Durgah at Ajmer.⁹⁹

Delhi conspiracy case (Hardinge-Bomb case): who was the real accused?

One of the very interesting episodes which took place during the trial of the Delhi conspiracy case was that the whole case was based on circumstantial evidence and that there was lack of direct evidence.¹⁰⁰ To quote the words of Mr. Alston: "However, as there was no direct evidence on the point and as it might be thought indirect evidence was not sufficient in itself to bring home legal proof we have not set out the Delhi-Bomb outrage in the way we have set out the later Lahore Garden's bomb case." Delivering the judgment Mr. Harrison, temporary additional Sessions Judge, Delhi, observed,¹⁰¹ "There is certainly no legal proof on the subject and it is merely an interesting coincidence that two months after the plan of campaign was formed in Lahore, a bomb precisely similar to those used in recent outrages in Calcutta and to that used in May, 1913, in Lahore was thrown at Delhi, and that the two accused who stand charged with having actually perpetrated that Lahore outrage, were absent from Lahore when this happened.... Although there is no proof that this organisation had any hand in the throwing of the Delhi bomb, the literature which they published soon after shows how cowardly the members approved of this outrage...."¹⁰² Though Balmukund was arrested and hanged in connection with 'Hardinge-Bomb' case,¹⁰³ yet, it is

99. Jain, Ajit Prasad, *Agyat Jeevan*, pp. 117-129, Prayag, 1951.

100. Judgment delivered by Mr. M. Harrison, Temporary Additional Sessions Judge, Delhi in the Delhi-Lahore Conspiracy Case, Home, Pol., A, Jany. 1915, Nos. 134-137, NAI.

101. *Ibid.*

102. According to Dina Nath, who turned approver, the main accused in the conspiracy were Abad Behari, Balmukund and Dina Nath.

103. Judgment in Delhi Conspiracy Case, *op. cit.*, NAI.

believed that Thakur Jorawar Singh Barhat, an ex-Kamdar of the Maharani of Jodhpur, who was wearing burka, had thrown a bomb from Marwari Library, Chandni Chowk, Delhi, and remained absconded with his revolutionary cousin Kunwar Pratap Singh Barhat.¹⁰⁴

Kesri Singh Barhat and the Kota group of revolutionaries

Like Arjun Lal Sethi, Kesri Singh Barhat had formed a small group of revolutionaries at Kota, the important members of which were Dr. Guru Dutt, Laxmi Narain, Hiralal Lahiri and others. Kesri Singh Barhat was of the view that on the lines of 'Bengal secret societies' secret societies should also be formed in Rajasthan and young men should similarly be prepared to serve the country. According to him, the funds should be raised or collected by way of dacoities and murders and the money thus collected should be spent in establishing the secret societies, institutions and in collecting arms. He was also of the view that to make public opinion favourable revolutionary literature should be printed and distributed. The ultimate object of this group was to obtain 'Swaraj'.¹⁰⁵

Murder of Sadhu at Kota

The group, therefore, to obtain funds for the realisation of its object, prepared a plan under the guidance of Kesri Singh Barhat and his associates to kill a wealthy sadhu of Jodhpur. According to the plan one Piary Lal Sadhu was to be called to Kota through one Ram Karan who was well known to the Sadhu. According to the plan Ram Karan reached Jodhpur and brought the wealthy Sadhu to Kota successfully.¹⁰⁶ His lodging ar-

104. Deepak, Jagdish Prasad: *Revenged in London* (1958).

105. Evidence in Kota Murder Case, File No. 3 of 1914, Raj. State Archives, Bikaner, (ii) Sec., I, May, 1916. Nos. 65-67, F. & P., NAI.

106. Evidence in the Kota Murder case. File No. 3 of 1914, Raj., State Archives, Bikaner; Sec., I, May, 1916. Nos. 65-67, F. & P. Deptt., NAI.

rangements were made in the Rajput Boarding House.¹⁰⁷ At this stage, the plan of Sadhu's assassination was implemented. According to the plan, poison was to be mixed with milk and given to the Sadhu, but when there was no effect on Piary Lal Sadhu, Hira Lal Lahiri stabbed the Sadhu to death on 25th June, 1912.¹⁰⁸ In spite of the vehement search the police could not lay its hands on anybody till after six months when a letter written by Ram Karan to Kesri Singh Barhat in code language was recovered by the police. In this letter Ram Karan had stated that the "flour might have become rotten by then and may be, therefore, thrown to the fishes in the Chambal."¹⁰⁹ This was interpreted to mean that the remains of the Sadhu should now be thrown into the river to remove any sign of evidence in case an enquiry is made into the matter.¹¹⁰

When the conspiracy came to light during the search of Arjun Lal Sethi's school at Indore, Kesri Singh Barhat, Hira Lal Lahiri, Ram Karan and Hiralal Jalori were arrested and prosecuted for the murder of the Sadhu. During the trial one of the accused, Laxmi Lal Kayastha, turned approver but Jorwar Singh went underground, and in spite of a reward of Rs. 500 offered by the State of Kota¹¹¹ for the arrest he could not be captured. As a result of the prosecution twenty years' imprisonment was awarded to Kesri Singh Barhat, Hiralal Lahiri and Ram Karan and seven years' imprisonment for Hiralal Jalori.¹¹² After some time Kesri Singh was released by mistake¹¹³ under the general amnesty granted to Indian prisoners after the first world war in 1919.

107. Evidence in Kota murder case, File No. 3 of 1914, *op. cit.*, Raj. State Archives, Bikaner.

108. Home, Pol., B, July, 1914, Nos. 124-128, NAI. F. & P. Deptt., NAI. Sec I, May, 1916, Nos. 65-67.

109. File No. 3 of 1914, Raj. State Archives, Bik., F. & P. Deptt., Sec., I, May, 1916; Nos. 65-67; NAI.

110. *Ibid.*

111. Home, Pol., B, Dec., 1914, Nos. 227-229, NAI.

112. Home, Pol., B, Dec., 1914, Nos. 227-229, NAI.

113. Int., June, 1920; Nos. 471-487, Part B (Printed) F. & P., NAI.

Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa and Revolutionaries

In the revolutionary activities of the pre-Gandhian period in Ajmer Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa¹¹⁴ was the principal actor and Seth Damodar Das Rathi¹¹⁵ of Kirshana Mills Ltd., Beawar, was the man who financed these activities, sheltered prominent revolutionaries and encouraged Swadeshi industries.¹¹⁶ Kharwa became the centre for refuge of revolutionaries. Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa used to collect arms for the revolutionaries and for the assistance in his revolutionary activities he appointed Bhop Singh, alias Vijay Singh Pathik, who soon became his right hand man.¹¹⁷ Rao Gopal Singh Kharwa had also secret contacts with Rash Behari Bose,¹¹⁸ a great Indian revolutionary and through him with other revolutionaries of Northern India. The Ajmer group of revolutionaries, in fact, was unearthed during the trial of Nimej murder case and of the Kota murder case.¹¹⁹ In this connection Director of Criminal Intelligence reported as follows:¹²⁰

“Gopal Singh and Kesri Singh were mixed up with the seditionists in British India and were furthering plots and conspiracies directly affecting British India. When the Thakur was called upon to explain he spun out an evasive statement mouth after mouth, and meanwhile continued his plotting, and remained in possession of an extra-ordinary arsenal of fire arms and ammunitions.”

The British Government had taken a very serious view of

114. Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa, a prominent 'Istimrardar' of this place was the leader of the revolutionaries.

115. Shri Rathi was a very courageous man. He was in close contact with Shyamaji Krishna Varma and Arbindo Ghosh. Both the revolutionaries had stayed with Rathi several times during their visit in Rajasthan. Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 27-29.

116. Deepak, Jagdish Prashad: *Revenged in London*; Kela Bhagwan Das: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 26.

117. Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 27-29.

118. It is also believed that when a bomb was thrown on Lord Hardinge in Chandni Chowk, Delhi, on 23rd Dec., 1910, Rash Behari was also present there. Saxena, S. S.: *Pathik Jeevni*.

119. F. & P. Deptt., Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

120. *Ibid.*

the Rao's activities and accordingly the A.G.G. in Rajasthan had warned him to keep away from his seditious activities. But Rao Gopal Singh did not pay any heed to it and continued to plan for an armed revolt to get rid of the British during the first world war.¹²¹

Plot for a revolt during the first world war

In 1914, when the first world war broke out in Europe the revolutionaries tried to make capital out of it by planning an armed revolt in Northern India. The key figures in this conspiracy were Rash Behari Bose and Schindra Nath Sanyal.¹²² Gopal Singh of Kharwa was also in league with Rash Behari Bose in the Lahore Plot.¹²³ Manilal, as a messenger of Bose, visited Kharwa in the middle of February, 1915, and delivered the message that 21st February, 1915, was the day for the revolution which would begin with an attack on Delhi by Rash Behari Bose, with forces which he would bring from the Punjab. In the message Rao Gopal Singh was asked to join the revolution¹²⁴ for which he had promised to help them with men and material. Rao was even hopeful to have the co-operation of Sir Pratap in case the rebellion broke out.¹²⁵ Rao Gopal Singh and Bhoop Singh alias Vijay Singh Pathik waited for several hours for the signal in a jungle near the Ajmer-Nasirabad Railway track. Bhop Singh was deputed by Rash Behari Bose in Rajasthan to keep an eye on the steps Maharaja Ganga Singh of Bikaner and Sir Pratap of Jodhpur took to join hands with the terrorists to help get the throne of Delhi for the Maharana Fateh Singh of Mewar. If Rash Behari succeeded at Delhi with army detachments from Multan, Lahore and Meerut and one other place (may be Delhi), the armies of Jodhpur and Bikaner were to march under Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa for the

121. *Ibid.*

122. Sedition Committee Report.

123. Statement of approver Manilal, F. & P., Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

124. *Ibid.*

125. *Ibid.*

emancipation of Ajmer. But Manilal, who turned approver, betrayed and directly rushed to Kharwa instead of to Multān wherefrom he was to bring an army.¹²⁶ And, thus, the plot fizzled out.

Rao Gopal Singh was served with an externment order by the Commissioner and Superintendent of Police, at Kharwa on 26th June, 1915¹²⁷ to leave Kharwa within twenty-four hours and reach Todgarh¹²⁸ within thirty-six hours¹²⁹ and to report to the Tehsildar there. According to the order during his stay at Todgarh Rao was not to meet or see any one without the permission of the Tehsildar and all his telegrams, letters, parcels, etc., were to be handed over to the Tehsildar. He was to report his presence to the Tehsildar, once in a day, at the appointed time and was not to leave the boundary of Todgarh. Disobedience of the orders would entail imprisonment for three years and also fine.¹³⁰ Rao, however, had already so managed that a large number of armed retainers had gathered at Todgarh and therefore when he was asked to surrender, he refused to do so.¹³¹ When Rao left Kharwa for Todgarh, his minor heir, Ganpat Singh, accompanied him up to Beawar. When parting with his son Rao Gopal Singh told him, "Be faithful to your country."¹³²

Rao's escape from Todgarh and recapture

When Rao got the news that Police were making searches for Bhoop Singh, alias, Vijay Singh Pathik, he was upset and fled from his internment at Todgarh on 10th July, 1915.¹³³ This created a stir. Commenting over the incident Sir C. R. Cleaveland,

126. Deepak, Jagdish Chandra: *Revenged in London*.

127. F. & P., Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

128. Todgarh is seventy-five miles away by cart-road from Kharwa.

129. F. & P. Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

130. *Ibid.*

131. *Ibid.*

132. Told by Sardar Bahadur Bhagwan Singh, Barrister, who was a Police Officer at that time to Shri Deepak. Deepak, Jagdish Prasad: *Revenged in London*.

133. F. & P. Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI. Statement of Sardar Bahadur Bhagwan Singh, *op. cit.*, *Revenged in London*.

Director Criminal Intelligence, said:¹³⁴ "This is the first really serious case we have had on any one disobeying the order of a local Government." However, Rao surrendered in a temple of Shivji at Salambad in Kishangarh State on 28th August, 1915 after an assurance given by Mr. Kaye, Inspector General of Police, Ajmer, that he will be treated "as a political prisoner". Subsequently the Benaras conspiracy case was withdrawn and he was sentenced to two years' simple imprisonment by the District Magistrate, Ajmer, for "a breach of rules framed under the Defence of India Act."¹³⁵ Rao asked for legal assistance, but it was refused by the Commissioner, saying that when Kharwa¹³⁶ was taken over, the Treasury was empty.¹³⁷ The inhabitants of the Kharwa village also requested the Government to release Rao Gopal Singh,¹³⁸ but with no success. Rao Gopal Singh Kharwa was detained at Tihar Jail in Shahjahanpur under Bengal Regulation Act, 1818.¹³⁹

Activities of Pratap Singh Barhat and Sachindra Nath Sanyal

As Arjun Lal Sethi, Kesri Singh Barhat, Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa were arrested the leadership passed into the hands of Pratap Singh Barhat,¹⁴⁰ Brij Mohanlal¹⁴¹ and Chotey Lal.¹⁴² Pratap Singh Barhat was an enthusiastic revolutionary and once again a conspiracy for an armed revolt was planned in collaboration of dissatisfied elements of the Indian Army.

134. F. & P. Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

135. *Ibid.*

136. The Government of India cancelled his sanad as an 'Istirmardar' and declared his estate as forfeited. F. & P. Deptt., Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

137. Deepak, Jagdish Chandra: *Revenged in London*.

138. F. & P. Int., July, 1916, Part B, Nos. 136-137, NAI.

139. Secret, I, May, 1918; Nos. 2-12; NAI.

140. Pratap Singh Barhat was the son of Kesri Singh Barhat. He was of short stature, of fair complexion, small eyed, an influential personality. Choudhary, R. N.: *op cit.*, pp. 30-32.

141. He was Superintendent of Art School, Jaipur.

142. He had come back to Jaipur after being acquitted in Delhi Bomb case for lack of evidence.

Pingley was sent to Meerut.¹⁴³ It was decided that Sir Reginald Kradok, Home Member of the Government of India, may be shot dead as a signal for the revolt by the Meerut and other garrisons.¹⁴⁴ The responsibility to shoot Sir Reginald Kradok¹⁴⁵ was entrusted to Jai Chand¹⁴⁶ who was staying in Haridwar in the Ashram of Baba Kali Kamliwala.¹⁴⁷ Ram Narain Choudhry, who was also a member of the group of Rajasthan revolutionaries, was asked to go to Haridwar and to bring Jai Chand for the purpose. In spite of the strict police arrangements Ram Narain Choudhry could reach the Ashram of Baba Kali Kamliwala, but Jai Chand expressed his inability to perform the work as "he was busy in a dacoity."¹⁴⁸ Hence, Ram Narain Choudhry had to return empty handed. Now the work of assassination was entrusted to Pratap Singh Barhat, but incidentally Sir Kradok did not turn up on the date fixed for the purpose of assassination and this saved him.¹⁴⁹ On the other hand Pingley was arrested in the barracks of 12th Cavalry in Meerut cantonment along with a box of time bombs which were sufficient to annihilate half a Regiment.¹⁵⁰ Thus one more attempt for an armed revolt failed.

Arrest of Pratap Singh Barhat and Benaras conspiracy case

In due course the warrants for the arrest of Pratap Singh Barhat were issued in Benaras conspiracy case but he went underground and became a compounder in a Hospital in Hyderabad

143. Choudhry, R. N., *op. cit.*, pp. 30-32. Ram Narain Choudhry himself was a member of this group and was involved in this conspiracy.

144. Choudhry, R. N.: *Op. cit.*, pp. 30-32.

145. Sanyal, Sachindra Nath: *Bandi Jeevan*, Part II, p. 34.
Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 30-32.

146. Jai Chand was a member of the group of Rajasthan revolutionaries and was absconding since the Nimej murder case.

147. Choudhry, Ram Narain, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-32.

148. *Ibid.*

149. *Ibid.*

150. *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 154.

(Sind).¹⁵¹ In the meantime, Police came to know something about the whereabouts of Pratap and thus reached Jaipur and began to enquire about Pratap from an Oswal family. This Oswal family, due to harassment given by the police, disclosed that Pratap was in Hyderabad but instead of Hyderabad (Sind) the family gave an address in Hyderabad (Deccan). The police rushed in search of Pratap to Hyderabad (Deccan). Meanwhile Jaipur associates sent Ram Narain Choudhry to Hyderabad (Sind) so that Pratap may seek shelter at some safer place.¹⁵² On hearing about his search he left Hyderabad and on his return Pratap thought it proper to drop down at Ashanada station near Jodhpur and to contact the Station Master, who was also a member of their group. But a few days ago a parcel of Bombs was discovered at the station and the Station Master in order to save himself had turned an approver. This led to the arrest of Pratap. Thereafter he was tried in connection with the Benaras conspiracy case and was sentenced to five years imprisonment.¹⁵³ According to the judgment, "Pratap's services were utilised by the conspirators to get into touch with the disaffected people in Central India and Pratap supported the conspirators."¹⁵⁴

Ram Narain Choudhry and his activities

When Pratap Singh Barhat had got down at the Ashanada Station it was decided that Ram Narain Choudhry would wait for Pratap in Bikaner. As such when Pratap did not reach Bikaner as per plan, Ram Narain Choudhry wrote out a letter to the Station Master at Ashanada.¹⁵⁵ This gave a hint to the police and within three days C.I.D. Inspector Magan Raj Vyas reached Bikaner to arrest Ram Narain Choudhry.¹⁵⁶ But due to the in-

151. In Hyderabad (Sindh) also Pratap used to propagate revolutionary ideas among the youths. Choudhary, R. N., *op. cit.*, pp. 32-34.

152. Ram Narain: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 32-34.

153. Judgment in Benaras conspiracy case. F. & P. Deptt., Sec. I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

154. *Ibid.*

155. Choudhary, Ram Narain: *Op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

156. *Ibid.*

fluence of Choudhry's uncle he was not arrested. Ram Narain Choudhry immediately left Bikaner for Jaipur and in Jaipur it was decided that to avoid arrest he should go underground and may stay at Sambher with one Krishna Sodhani.¹⁵⁷

In November 1915, when long imprisonments had already been awarded to Sachindra Nath Sanyal and Pratap Singh Barhat in Benaras conspiracy case, Ram Narain Choudhry returned to home town in Neem-Ka-Thana (District Sikar) but Choudhry was being shadowed by the C.I.D. Inspector Magan Raj Vyas. Now it was decided to shoot down the C.I.D. Inspector. According to the plan, Ram Narain Choudhry was to engage Magan Raj Vyas in Edward Memorial and Chotey Lal would shoot him, but the plan, however, could not be implemented.¹⁵⁸ Later Ram Narain Choudhry accepted the job of a teacher in a Middle School in Ramgarh (Shekhawati) and assembled once again a group of revolutionaries.¹⁵⁹ But this group could not undertake any activity worth noting.

Revolutionary activities at Jaipur

In 1915, one Jain Vakil entered the group of revolutionaries in Jaipur. In 1915, it was decided to distribute a pamphlet against the Resident and the Prime Minister of Jaipur.¹⁶⁰ The draft was prepared by Ram Narain Choudhry and the pamphlet was cyclostyled by the Jain Vakil at a cycle stall and was distributed by the Manager of 'Vyanjana Vilas Company'.¹⁶¹ On the next day the pamphlet was found affixed on all the important

157. Krishna Sodhani was also one of the members of the revolutionary group of Calcutta. Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 35-36.

158. Choudhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.

159. The members of this group were Bal Krishna Poddar, Laxman Prasad and Motilal Prehlad, Choudhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 42-45.

160. Choudhry, Ram Narain, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

161. To propagate the revolutionary ideas the group of Ram Narain Choudhry opened a company under the name 'Vyanjana Vilas Company'. Choudhry, Ram Narain: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 29-30.

gates, schools, Colleges, Palaces, Police Stations, etc.¹⁶² The Police removed the pamphlet but the mission was already fulfilled.¹⁶³ After a vigorous investigation the cyclostyled pamphlet was captured from the residence of the Jain Vakil. In spite of torture he did not disclose the plan and thus further arrests were averted.¹⁶⁴

First World War and the Indian attitude

During the years when the extremists at times resorted to terrorist activities and various repressive measures were undertaken the Congress was organising a mass movement against foreign domination. At this juncture the advent of Mahatma Gandhi with a novel technique to fight against the foreign rule was significant. As the leader of independence movement he thought that non-violent efforts could alone compel the alien rulers to withdraw. As an admirer of the English people and as one dedicated to democracy and peace, he was prepared to help the British when the 1st world war broke out. He conducted political negotiations with remarkable astuteness and influenced his followers and intellectuals to place themselves unconditionally at the disposal of the authorities. An unprecedented enthusiasm appeared in the country and India offered all, what she had, in this hour of necessity.¹⁶⁵

Response from the Native States

The response from the Native States was very enthusiastic and spontaneous. The Princes were so eager to co-operate with the British venture that they even placed their personal services at the disposal of His Majesty. Their sentiments can be summed up in the simple words of one of them: "what orders has

162. *Ibid.*

163. *Ibid.*

164. *Ibid.*

165. Expressing the sentiments of loyalty, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu had said: "Lo; I have flung to the East and West, Priceless Treasures torn from my breast, And yielded the sons of my stricken womb, To the drum beats of duty the sabres of doom". *Indian Contributions in the War*, Vol. I.

my King for me and my troops."¹⁶⁶ The Maharaja of Bikaner was the first to offer his services telegraphically to His Majesty and the Viceroy. The Maharaja said: "I and my troops are ready and prepared to go at once to any place you command. But whether my troops can be used at the present or not I would earnestly ask, your Excellency, at least to give myself an opportunity for that personal military service of King Emperor and the Empire, which is my highest ambition as a Rathore Chief."¹⁶⁷

The example was followed by almost all the Chiefs of Rajasthan. Sir Pratap of Jodhpur, at the ripe old age of seventy years, insisted on going to the battle-field, "for that was the place for a Rajput" and accordingly was permitted to go to the war front.¹⁶⁸ A resolution was passed by the Representative Assembly of Bikaner reiterating "loyalty and devotion of the Bikaner subjects to the person and throne of His Majesty the King Emperor."¹⁶⁹ The services rendered by the native chiefs in men and material were remarkable. The State of Bikaner sent its famous Ganga Risala and Sadul Light Infantry to the Middle East (Egypt) war front where they operated for four years.¹⁷⁰ The Bikaner State contributions in all forms amounted to Rs. 95,64,026 by the year 1918.¹⁷¹ An offer was also extended by the Maharajas of Bikaner and Jodhpur for the manufacture of munitions of war in the State.¹⁷² The famous Bharatpur Imperial Service Infantry along with Transport Corps participated in active warfare. Besides, the Bharatpur State contributed twenty lakhs of rupees towards war loan.¹⁷³

166. *Indian Contributions in the War*, Vol. I, (N. K. Press, Lucknow).

167. *Narrative of the State of Bikaner*, (a State Govt. publication about the participation of the State in First World War, 1933), p. 51.

168. *Indian Year Book*, 1915, edited by Stanley Reid.

169. F. & P. Int., June, 1915, Nos. 29-31, Part A. NAI.

170. F. & P. Sept., 1915, Nos. 488-511 NAI; *Administration Report of the Bikaner State*, 1916.

171. *Narrative of the State of Bikaner*, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-179.

172. F. & P. Int., Sept., 1915, Nos. 488-511, NAI.

173. Somerset, Playne: *Indian States*, p. 153.

The Maharaja of Jaipur, Alwar, Kishangarh, Karauli, Kota and other Chiefs offered personal services and placed the resources of the State at the disposal of the British Government.¹⁷⁴ The Maharaja of Dholpur presented a gift of fifty horse-power Fiat motor car to the Government for being used in the war.¹⁷⁵ The Maharaja placed at the disposal of the British Government his houses at Agra for stitching the uniforms for military personnel.

Thus a keen interest was shown in all the States for the collection of money and material and for the recruitment of the personnel.¹⁷⁶ In Jodhpur, in order to meet the increasing demands for recruitment many concessions, bonuses and rewards were granted by the Darbar.¹⁷⁷

Mont-Ford Report and Indian States (1919)

In the Montague-Chelmsford Report the services rendered by the Native States were greatly appreciated,¹⁷⁸ and the Princes were assured that the rights, dignities and privileges secured to them by the treaties would not in any way be impaired.¹⁷⁹ The Report further suggested to establish a permanent institution namely 'Chamber of Princes', and a standing committee of the Chamber of Princes, to appoint a commission of enquiry in cases of misconduct of the Indian Princes.¹⁸⁰

Chamber of Princes

Accordingly a Royal Proclamation for the establishment of the Chamber of Princes (Narendra Mandal) was made on 23rd December, 1919,¹⁸¹ by His Majesty the King Emperor and the

174. F. & P. Int., May, 1915, Nos. 201-545, Part B, NAI.

175. F. & P. Int., August, 1915, Nos. 365-369, Part B, NAI.

176. F. & P. Int., March, 1915, No. 211, Part B, NAI.

177. *Administrative Report of the Jodhpur State*, 1916-17.

178. *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms*, Govt. of India, p. 190.

179. *Ibid.*, pp. 190-194.

180. *Ibid.*, pp. 194-198.

181. F. & P., Int., Feb., 1920, No. 2, (Deposit), NAI.

Chamber was inaugurated at Delhi by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught on 8th February, 1921, with the hope that "the Chamber will be a means by which the bonds of mutual understanding will be strengthened and the growing identity of interests between the Indian States and the rest of the Empire will be fostered and developed."¹⁸² The British Government was confident that the rulers will prove helpful in stabilising the British Empire in India. The Duke of Connaught, reminding the Indian Princes of their responsibilities, said, "I know well that your Highnesses will appreciate the trust reposed in you by His Imperial Majesty and his Government will worthily respond both as pillars of the Empire and as rulers striving over for the greater happiness of your subjects."¹⁸³

The only achievement of the Chamber was to get an enactment known as "The Indian States Act, 1922" (Princes' Protection Act, 1922) to suppress the States' people's ideas and expressions, which were to be published in British India newspapers.¹⁸⁴ As Sir Mac Munn observes, "It would be quite in order for their His Majesty's to discuss what course would be pursued by them if the Congress and lawyers from outside come into their States to prove such fun at them as good-natured and foolish John Bull has put up with these past twenty years."¹⁸⁵

Congress activities after the 1st World War

India's co-operation in the First World War, as far as it went, could by no means satisfy the aspirations and hope which had been entertained at its beginning. Mahatma Gandhi's help to the British at the time of crisis could only produce retalia-

182. *The Chamber of Princes Report*, 1921, pp. 1-7.

183. *Ibid.*

184. Clause III, Part I of the Act read, "whosoever edits, prints or publishes or is the author of any book, newspaper or any other document which brings or intended to bring in to hatred and contempt, excites or is intended to excite disaffection towards any Prince or Chief of a State shall be punishable with imprisonment which may be extended to five years, or with fine or with both."

185. Mac Munn, Georg: *The Indian States and the Princes*.

tion and adoption of excessive repressive measures by the authorities. The whole nation was outraged when in April, 1919 troops were ordered by General Dyer to fire on an unarmed assembly at Amritsar. The new Act which had come into force under the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms could not satisfy the nationalists. The elections under the Act were boycotted by the Congress, and under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi the first civil disobedience movement was launched.

'Rajasthan Kesri' and 'Tarun Rajasthan'

As a result of these activities of the Congress, it was difficult to prevent political movements in Rajasthan. Newspapers and Associations began to emerge with an object to awaken the people and to make them more conscious of their duties. In 1920, 'Rajasthan Kesri' was published from Wardha¹⁸⁶ with an object to giving wide publicity to the agitations launched in the various native States in Rajasthan. Vijai Singh Pathik became its editor and Ram Narain Choudhary, Hari Bhai Kinker, Kanhiya Lal Kalyantri became his associates. In the beginning Arjun Lal Sethi and Kesri Singh Barhat also contributed in the form of articles to the newspaper. 'Rajasthan Kesri' was the first newspaper of its kind which appeared on behalf of the States' people of Rajasthan. Soon the paper established its reputation and became the powerful propaganda organ of the people of Rajasthan.

Political activities in Ajmer

Thus, at this time in Ajmer three groups were working. The first group was under the leadership of Vijai Singh Pathik, working under the guidance of Rajasthan Sewa Sangh, the second group was operating under Arjun Lal Sethi, the leader of the Congress Party with its various branches at Beawar, Kekri, Pushkar, Kota, Karauli, Jodhpur and Indore and the third group consisted of 'Gandhists' under the leadership of

186. Choudhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 52-54.

Jamna Lal Bajaj and Hari Bhau Upadhyaya.¹⁸⁷

On 15th March, 1921, the Second Session of the Rajasthan Political Conference was held at Ajmer,¹⁸⁸ with Moti Lal Nehru as its President. Maulana Shaukat Ali appealed to the Muslims to support the non-co-operation movement.¹⁸⁹ The conference adopted a resolution and called upon the people to boycott the foreign cloth and goods. Pt. Gauri Shankar was the first among the noted individuals of Ajmer, who gave a lead in boycotting foreign clothes and became a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. The non-co-operation movement was, therefore, successfully launched in Ajmer.¹⁹⁰

Rajasthan-Madhya Bharat Sabha

As a result of the general amnesty granted to the political prisoners the important leaders of Rajasthan like Arjun Lal Sethi, Kesri Singh Barhat and Rao Gopal Singh Kharwa were also released, the objective of the Sabha was to propagate the ideas of political liberty and freedom in Rajasthan. They organised a session of the Rajasthan-Madhya Bharat Sabha in March, 1920 at Ajmer under the Presidentship of Jamna Lal Bajaj.¹⁹¹ Accordingly 'Tarun Rajasthan' was started from Malipura, Ajmer, under the supervision and guidance of Vijai Singh Pathik, Arjun Lal Sethi and Thakur Kesri Singh Barhat. Later, it was shifted to Wardha under the title 'Navin Rajasthan'.

Rajasthan Seva Sangh

Similarly, in 1919, the 'Rajasthan Seva Sangh' was esta-

187. Unfortunately there was lack of co-operation amongst all the three groups. Choudhry, R. N.: *Partman Rajasthan*, pp. 143-149.

188. F. & P. Int., Sept., 1921, Secret, Part B, NAI.

189. F. & P. Int., Sept., 1921; Secret; Part B, NAI.

190. F. & P. Int., Feb., 1921, Nos. 66-67, Part B, NAI.

191. The first session of the Sabha was held in the building of Marwari Pustkalaya, Chandni Chowk, Delhi. Kela, p. 46. Shri Bajaj was a resident of Sikar (Jaipur State). At that time he was running big business at Wardha. Shri Ganesh Shanker Vidyarthi and his '*Pratap*' also played an important role in propagating the nationalist ideas among the States' people. Shri Vidyarthi was also one of the organisers of the Sabha. Kela: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, pp. 302-04.

blished in Wardha, and later in 1920 was shifted to Ajmer. The main object of the Seva Sangh was to obtain redress of the grievances of the public, to support the rightful claims of the Rulers and Jagirdars and to create friendly relations between the people and the Jagirdars.¹⁹² The various branches of the Seva Sangh were established in Bundi, Jaipur, Jodhpur and Kota. The Sangh guided Bijoliya and Bengu movements and exposed the Police atrocities committed at Bundi, Sirohi and Udaipur.

These activities of the Sangh riled the British Government and on 1st March, 1924, Ram Narain Choudhry and Shobhalal Gupta were arrested under section 124A of the Cr.PC. and a search warrant was issued against the Seva Sangh,¹⁹³ for publishing seditious material in the 'Tarun Rajasthan' issues dated 23rd and 30th December, 1923. Both the accused faced the trial before the City Magistrate, Ajmer. The City Magistrate delivering his judgment acquitted Ram Narain Chowdhry but Shobhalal Gupta was sentenced to two years rigorous imprisonment.¹⁹⁴ In 1924, due to the differences that arose among the founding members of the Sangh, the Sangh started to decline in respect of its influence and was completely defunct by the year 1928.¹⁹⁵

Attitude of the Indian National Congress (1921-24)

While such activities were organised by the Congress in British India, the policy of non-interference in the State affairs was maintained by the Congress since its establishment. In 1920, the Congress session was organised at Nagpur. Simultaneously, a session of the Rajasthan-Madhya Bharat Sabha was also held. In the session an exhibition was organised in which the iniquitous taxes, oppressive land revenue, barbarous methods of punishment, cases of gross injustice, grinding poverty of the

192. Kela, Bhagwandass: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 64.

193. Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 258-275; Kela, Bhagwandass: *op. cit.*, pp. 84, 302-304; Raghubir Singh: *Purva Adhunik Rajasthan*, p. 326.

194. *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 2nd March, 30th March, 1924.

195. *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 16th Nov., 1924.

people, the luxuries of the nobles, lack of medical and educational facilities, the mediæval means of transport, extremely backward system of administration, etc.,¹⁹⁶ were shown with a view to acquainting the delegates of the All-India National Congress about the situation prevailing in Indian States and particularly in the States of Rajasthan. The greatest success of the Sabha was that it could gain the influential and powerful supporters like Seth Govind Dass and Swami Nar Singh Dev. In 1921, Mahatma Gandhi moved a resolution with regard to non-violent, non-co-operation movement, "as the only civilised and effective substitute for an armed rebellion."¹⁹⁷

Inspired by the Congress resolution, the Rajasthan group of Satyagrahis also launched the peasants' movements in various parts of Rajasthan particularly in Bundi, Begun (Mewar), and Shekhawati (Jaipur). The Bijolia movement from its inception took a revolutionary turn.

Bijolia Movement (1913-1922)

It was in the year 1913 when a peasants' agitation was started in the Jagir of Bijolia¹⁹⁸ under the leadership of Sadhu Sitaramdas, though later on Bhoop Singh alias Vijai Singh Pathik led the agitation. The cultivators raised their voice against certain taxes and imposts levied by the Jagirdar of Bijolia. In addition to the land revenue there were as many as 80 different 'Lagats' levied from them.¹⁹⁹ The cultivator had to pay several taxes at the time of harvest, festivals, marriages, birth days,

196. Kela, B.D. *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*; Chowdhry, R. N., *op. cit.*, pp. 55-56. In the Nagpur session the Congress pledged to achieve independence for the whole country alongwith the Indian States. This removed the fear that British India will only get independence and Indian States will continue to remain under the tyrannical rule of the Princes.

197. Resolution moved by Mahatma Gandhi in 36th Session of Indian National Congress at Ahmedabad.

198. Bijolia is situated at a distance of about 30 miles south-east of the town of Bundi beyond which the Aravali Hills make a bend to the east. The nearest railway Station is Kota, which is 62 miles away from Bijolia. The place is also known as 'Upper-Mal'.

199. Chowdhry, R.N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.

installations of the Chiefs and many other social and ceremonial functions and if the cultivator failed in fulfilling the demands, he was to be badly tortured.²⁰⁰ The 'Begar' system was prevailing and the labourers had to do according to the wishes of Jagirdars on occasions like marriage, hunting, visit of State officials, etc. It is interesting to note that on such occasions, the labourers were not paid anything in cash or kind and they had to procure their food themselves.²⁰¹ The result was that most of the cultivators were reduced to paupers owing to this oppression and injustice.²⁰² The cultivators of Bijolia, therefore, suspended the cultivation for one year and refused to pay the revenue.²⁰³ In 1916 the estate was placed under the State management as the Chief of the State died that year and his son Kesri Singh was a minor.

Pathik reaches Bijolia

In the meanwhile, in 1915, Sadhu Sitaramdas met with Vijai Singh Pathik at Chittor and invited him to Bijolia 'the Andmans of Mewar's', where he was urgently required to organise the people against the cruelties of the Jagirdars. By the end of the year Pathik reached there and started the agitation with a new spirit.²⁰⁴ It is believed that Maharana Fatch Singh of Udaipur had sympathy with Pathik and had, therefore, directed his officials "not to lay their hands on him."²⁰⁵ In order to

200. F. & P. Files No. 596P, Secret, I of 1922-23, NAI.

201. Pathik's Statement before the Mewar Court, pp. 79-80.

202. *Ibid.*

203. F. & P. F. No. 596, P (Sec.), I of 1922-23, NAI.

204. Once Gandhiji had said about Pathik, 'I can tell you something about Pathik. Pathik is a soldier, brave, impetuous, but obstinate. He was Mahadev's infallible guide in Bijolia and the remarkable thing is that the masses of Bijolia have implicit confidence in him.' F. & P. Secret, I, March, 1917, Nos. 1-29, NAI.

Vijai Singh Pathik was Bhoop Singh, the revolutionary of the terrorist movement. Pathik was arrested in 1914 at Kharwa along with Rao Gopal Singh and was interned in the fort of Todgarh. But he managed to flee from there and entered Mewar in disguise calling himself Vijai Singh Pathik. Saxena, S. S.: *Pathik Jeevani*.

205. Mehta, Prithvi Singh: *Hamara Rajasthan*, pp. 323-33.

awaken the peasants of Bijolia, Pathik established 'Vidhya Pra-charni Sabha,' a school, a library and received a State grant of Rs. forty per month for the same.²⁰⁶

In 1916, a Kisan Panch Board was organised in the presence of one thousand cultivators and Sadhu Sitaramdas was elected its President. As a result of Pathik's achievement the Bijolia peasants refused to pay the 'War loan' which was levied at the rate of rupees fourteen per plough.²⁰⁷ The cultivators during their struggle consolidated their unity and organisation under their Kisan Panchayat. As they were non-co-operating with the Jagir Officials in all respects and were being compelled to protect their life and property themselves, they began to run a parallel government through their Panchayat.²⁰⁸ The cultivators organised a "Core of volunteers, who wore belts and badges of the Panchayat and guarded every village." The Panchayat had decided that no cultivator would have any direct dealings with the Thikana (Jagir) management and asked the latter to deal all cases of individuals through the Panchayat.²⁰⁹ At this stage the British Government got alarmed and it declared that "The 'Bolsheviks' had entered into Mewar and the hilly areas, and were creating dissatisfaction among the people, organising them into 'Soviets' and provoking them to revolt on the pattern of the Russian revolution."²¹⁰ The British Government, therefore, called upon the Maharana of Mewar and other Native Chiefs to take most severe measures to crush the 'Bolshevik movement' which was declared to be subversive of all human values and traditions and aimed at overthrowing the existing set up.²¹¹ In the meantime, to avoid arrest Pathik left

206. Mehta, Prithvi Singh: *Hamara Rajasthan*, pp. 323-324.

207. *Ibid.*, pp. 324-31.

208. *Rajputana Agency Records*, 1921, No. 69, List I, NAI.

209. *Rajputana Agency Records*, *op. cit.*, NAI.

210. Letter dt. 4th Feb., 1920, from R. R. Holland to Maharana Fateh Singh. *Rajputana Agency Records*, NAI.

211. Letter dt. 4th Feb., 1920, from A.G.G. to Maharaja Bhawani Singh of Jhalawar, *Rajputana Agency Records*, NAI.

Bijolia and entered into the territory of Kota from where he continued to guide the movement."²²

Various branches of Peasants' societies were established all over the Thikana and the peasants launched Satyagraha against the 'Lagats' and 'Begar' of the Thikana. In reply, Thikana resorted to repressive methods, thousands of peasants were arrested, which included Sadhu Sitaramdas, Ram Narain Choudhry, Prem Chand Bhil, and Manik Lal Varma, women-folk were insulted, and land was forfeited,²³ but the cultivators refused to surrender. Ram Narain Choudhry, who was sent to Bijolia for an on-the-spot enquiry, as a result of Gandhi-Pathik dialogue, observes:

"I saw that every man, woman, old and young had adopted 'BANDE MATARAM' in 'UPPER MAL',²⁴ and were filled with the nationalist sentiment."²⁵

The news of Bijolia Satyagraha was widely circulated by 'Tarun Rajasthan' and therefore it attracted the attention of the national leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Madan Mohan Malviya, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, and Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi.

A.G.G. Holland Proceeds to Bijolia

In the circumstances Sir Robert Holland, the A.G.G. in Rajasthan and Mr. Wilkinson, the Resident in Mewar, proceeded to Bijolia to settle up things with the police force, which was, however, left at Mandalgarh.²⁶ The State was represented by Prakash Chandra Chatterji, Diwan of the State and Beharilal Kaushik, the Hakim of the State and the Thikana was represented by Kamdar Hiralal, Fauzdar Tej Singh and Master

212. Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 59-63; Mehta, Prithvi Singh: *op. cit.*, pp. 323-31. F. & P. File No. 596, P (Secret), I of 1922-23, NAI; *Pathik's Statement before the Mewar Court*.

213. *Ibid.*

214. Since Bijolia is situated over a hill, it is popularly known as 'Upper Mal'.

215. Choudhry, Ram Narain: *op. cit.*, pp. 63-66.

216. Choudhry, Ram Narain: *op. cit.*, pp. 92-97.

Zalim Singh. The Bijolia peasants emphasised that during the negotiations the representatives of Rajasthan Sewa Sangh may also be included. Accordingly, Ram Narain Choudhry, Manik-lal Varma, Panchayat Sarpanch Moti Chand, and the Secretary of Sewa Sangh were invited to take part in the deliberations. The A.G.G. was highly impressed by the demands and the attitude of the cultivators and at several times during the deliberations he reprimanded the Thikana officials by saying, "I do not want lectures".²¹⁷ On most of the disputes the negotiations successfully ended, but when the question of 'Begar' came up, it was feared that negotiations might fail.²¹⁸ The A.G.G., however, placed a resolution in which it was said, "Peasants accept this as their duty that whenever any official will visit their village they will make the necessary arrangements like that of conveyance, labour and material, etc., on standard price." But the peasants refused to accept the resolution. Ram Narain Choudhry, however, intervened and suggested certain amendments. He inserted 'Samajik Dharma' (Social duty) instead of 'duty' and at the place of 'will make the necessary arrangements', suggested 'try to arrange'. In the end it was also added that, price will be fixed by the Sarpanch and in no case force will be used.²¹⁹ Peasants, however, on their part willingly agreed to add one more sentence that 'no remuneration will be charged in response to the services rendered in favour of Maharana of Udaipur and the Rao of Thikana.' In this way the resolution was approved both by the A.G.G. and the Bijolia cultivators and was welcomed by the huge crowd with 'Bande Mataram'.²²⁰

Thus the settlement fulfilled most of the demands of the cultivators. The system of taking forced labour (Begar) and most of the 'Lagats' was abolished. Cases launched against the cul-

217. Choudhry, R. N.: *op cit.*, pp. 92-97. Ram Narain Choudhry gives a detailed account in his '*Vartman Rajasthan*'.

218. The A.G.G. had remarked, "There is the rule, Mr. Chowdhry."

219. Choudhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 92-97.

220. *Ibid.*

tivators during the movement were withdrawn and land revenue of the years during which the land was not cultivated was waived. Concessions were also made to the demands of the cultivators relating to the forests, pastures, etc., and Kisan Panchayats were reorganised. Thus the Bijolia Satyagraha ended successfully in 1922.

Bengu Agitation (1921-22)

Inspired by the success of the Bijolia Satyagrahis, the Bengu²²¹ cultivators started the agitation against the Thikana. The Ravda Thakur of the Thikana resorted to violent methods and threatened the Satyagrahis to shoot them, but when one youngman Ram Niwas Sharma, a worker of the Rajasthan Sewa Sangh, came forward and challenged the Thakur to fire on him, the Thakur had to be submissive.²²² As a result of the efforts of the Sewa Sangh and Maniklal Varma, the peasants were awakened gradually and pledged not to drink, and to wear swadeshi. Untouchability was gradually abolished and Harijans began to become members and presidents of the Panchayat. The conservative Jagirdars could not tolerate these radical developments and they adopted a policy of repression to crush the agitation. The peasants suffered a good deal and even women did not escape insults.²²³

The cultivators, therefore, approached Vijai Singh Pathik at Ajmer and apprised him with their grievances. Accordingly, on behalf of the Rajasthan Sewa Sangh, Ram Narain Chowdhry was sent to Bengu for an *on-the-spot* enquiry. Ram Narain Chowdhry addressed the Panchayat and a largely attended public meeting near a village. Under instructions of Seth Amrit Lal Kamdar of Bengu, the Thikana Police was sent under the super-

221. Bengu was a small Thikana (Jagir) in Mewar near Bijoliya which is popularly known as 'Attari'.

222. Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 90-92.

223. F. & P. File No. 596 P, (Secret), I of 1922-23, NAI; Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 90-92. Ram Narain Chowdhry gives a detailed account about the repressive measures adopted by the Thikana and the manner in which the women were dishonoured and insulted, pp. 115-118.

vision of Laxmi Narayan Ojha and as soon as Ram Narain Chowdhry completed his lecture and left the place, the police opened fire on the peaceful cultivators.²²⁴ Thus the atrocities committed by the police and Seth Amritlal, the local Seth of Bengu, reached the climax. The peasants, in the circumstances, approached Mr. Trench, Revenue Commissioner, Mewar. He instead of taking any step against the Thikana authorities, on 13th July, 1923, proceeded along with the troops to Govindpura village and besieged it. He ordered to set the village on fire and then resorted to firing. It is believed that two persons were killed and several wounded.²²⁵ About 500 persons were arrested along with one hundred children, who were severely beaten and driven to Bengu.²²⁶ During the repression the soldiers entered into the houses and assaulted the women in the most shameful manner,²²⁷ with the result the cultivators became so much excited that they even decided to kill Ravda Thakur.²²⁸

Pathik is arrested

To uphold the morale of the Bengu cultivators, Vijai Singh Pathik along with Hariji secretly managed to reach Bengu and stayed with a Dhakar, but soon they were arrested and were

224. F. & P. File No. 596. P, (Secret). I of 1922-23, NAI; Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 73-75.

225. *Ibid.*

226. During the repression, Ghan Shyam Sharma, a worker of Rajasthan Seva Sangh was also arrested, who was kept in prison for 14 months without any trial. Later on 25th Feb., 1924, he was released. During his imprisonment he was brutally tortured. After his release he issued a long statement about the Police atrocities. '*Tarun Rajasthan*' dt. 16th Nov., 1924.

227. *Pathik's Statement before the Mewar Court*, p. 94. Chowdhary, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 90-92; Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

228. The work was entrusted to Birdi Singh, Jai Singh and Ram Singh, the young workers of Bengu. But the plan could not be implemented as all the three persons were arrested, and sent to Jaipur, where Ram Singh was interned at Rajnagar, and Jai Singh and Birdi Singh were interned in Bengu without trial. Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 135-137.

produced before a special bench²²⁹ constituted for the purpose at Udaipur and were charged of indulging in anti-State activities, of distributing the seditious literature and of disobeying the orders of the Mewar Maharana.²³⁰ During the trial Pathik emphasised that to have 'a sentiment of patriotism is not an offence' and 'the people have a right to rise against the cruelties committed on them.'²³¹ Ultimately, the Tribunal acquitted him, but the Mewar Government under special powers awarded him five years' imprisonment. In 1928, Pathik was released and was ex-terminated from Mewar.²³²

The atrocities committed by the Mewar State and Thikana officials on the peaceful cultivators were highly condemned so much so that open letters were addressed to the Mewar officials,²³³ and even the voice of protest was heard in the British Parliament.²³⁴

Peasants, agitation spread in other parts of Mewar

The cultivators' 'Movement', as it may be termed, thus began to spread far and wide in the State of Mewar. At the sacred place, Matrimundia, thousands of Kisans decided in 1921 to defy the State authorities until their grievances were redressed. In addition to the demand of abolishing all 'Lagats' and 'Bhet-Begar' they also demanded that "the revenue settle-

229. The members of the Bench were Surva Shri Tribhuvan Nath Shivpuri, Rati Lal Antani and Dal Chand Agarwal.

230. Proceedings of the Tribunal. *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 30 March, 1924.

231. *Pathik's statement before the Mewar Court.*

232. Judgment in Pathik Case, Deepak, Jagdish Chandra: *Jab Janta Jagi Thi*, p. 10; Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 115-118, 137-140.

233. *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 1st June, 1924.

234. The labour member, Mr. Walter Beker, had asked a question about the Mewar State repressive policy and about the atrocities committed by the Thikana Police on the peasants of Bijolia, Bengu and Bundi to which the S.S.I. replied, "I am writing to the Governor-General." In 'Workers Weekly' dt. 12th Dec., 1924, (a British newspaper), the news also appeared under the title 'Rajasthan in British Parliament', and an open enquiry into the incidents was demanded. *Leader*, dt. 23rd June, 1924, *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 29th June, 1924.

ment should again be undertaken as twenty years period fixed by Wingate, in the eighties of the 19th century, had long expired; that the cess collected for education and public health along with land revenue should be only half an anna and should be utilised for opening more schools and hospitals in the villages, that the taxes and duties levied on the sale of cattle and on the grazing of cattle in the pastures, etc., should be annulled.²³⁵ Thus the situation became critical. The sum and substance of the agitation has been narrated by Mr. Wilkinson, who stated, "Mewar is becoming a hot-bed of lawlessness. Seditionist emissaries were teaching the people that all men are equal. The Land belongs to the peasants and not to the State or landlords. It is significant that the people are being urged to use the vernacular equivalent of the word 'comrade' instead of customary honorific styles of address. His Highness is said to have been threatened to meet the fate of the 'Czar'." In the end, Wilkinson added, "the movement is mainly anti-Maharana, but it might soon become anti-British and spread to adjoining British areas."²³⁶

According to the British Resident, Maharana Fateh Singh himself was responsible for all this lawless situation as he had failed to control it and, therefore, he had suggested to the Viceroy that "Maharana should be pressed to resign." Accordingly, the Maharana was asked to delegate powers in favour of his son or face an enquiry.²³⁷ Thus the Maharana was placed in a very embarrassing position and there was no other alternative but to accept Viceroy's advice and to abdicate in favour of his son, though to get over the situation the Maharana unsuccessfully offered a bribe of rupees two lakhs to the A.G.G. through a banker on 15th July, 1921 "to extricate him from the difficulty."²³⁸

235. *Rajputana Agency Records*, 1921, No. 69, List I, NAI.

236. *Ibid.*

237. Letter dt. 17th July, 1921, from R. E. Holland, A.G.G. to Maharana Fateh Singh, *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 4th August, 1924.

238. Letter dt. 17th July, 1921, from the A.G.G. in Raj., to H. E. the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, *Rajputana Agency Records*, 1921, No. 69, List I, NAI.

Agitation in Bundi

Like Bijolia and Bengu, the cultivators of Bundi were also to pay a number of 'Lagats' and were subjected to forced labour, 'Begar'. Under the State order, the public meetings, national songs and slogans were prohibited. On 15th June, 1922, a number of cultivators were arrested and women were insulted and two of them were killed.²³⁹ On behalf of Rajasthan Seva Sangh Ram Narain Choudhry and Satya Bhakat were sent for an on-the-spot enquiry, who reported that the 'Begar' system was widely prevalent there, and civil liberties did not exist and even contributions to 'war fund' were extracted.²⁴⁰ It was further revealed that the peasants organised a meeting on 30th May, 1922 which was forcibly disturbed by the State officials and the police. On 31st May, 1922, the weekly Panchayat of the cultivators was held at Dabi. The State police committed every sort of cruelty and women were dishonoured and their chastity violated. Pandit Nainuram Sharma, who was the moving spirit behind this agitation, was therefore arrested²⁴¹ in December, 1922 and on 10th May, 1923, was awarded four years' imprisonment and as a result of his alleged anti-State and seditious activities was deported from the State.²⁴² The situation was, therefore, becoming serious day by day. In May, 1923, the police opened fire on the peaceful cultivators and the Satyagrahis were cruelly beaten and even women were not spared. One Nanak Bhil died on the spot.²⁴³ Rajasthan Seva Sangh gave a wide publicity to the police atrocities committed in Bundi as a result of which some grievances were redressed, though a ban was imposed on the entry of the members of the Seva Sangh in Bundi State.²⁴⁴

239. F. & P. File No. 596 P (Secret), 1 of 1922-23, NAI; Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 75.

240. Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*; Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 75

241. F. & P. File No. 596, P, (Secret), 1 of 1922-23, NAI; *Tarun Rajasthan*, 13th Jan., 1924.

242. F. & P. File No. 74, P of 1924, NAI; *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 13th Jany., 1924. Pt. Nainuram Sharma established Prajamandal in Kota but soon he was killed by a Kota citizen.

243. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79; F. & P. File No. 74 P of 1924, NAI.

244. Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 103-104; F. & P. File No. 74 P of 1924, NAI.

Unrest in Shekhawati

In 1921 a conference of the representatives of Shekhawati Seva Samities was organised in Chirawa (Shekhawati) under the presidentship of Master Kalicharan Sharma. The Jaipur State considered it a seditious activity, and Master Kalicharan Sharma and Pyare Lal Gupta were taken in police custody. They were forced to walk bare foot up to Khetri. This created a stir in Shekhawati, Calcutta and Bombay. Later, however, both the leaders were set free.²⁴⁵ This was the beginning of a political unrest in Shekhawati which resulted later in the Sikar agitation of 1932. Jammalal Bajaj along with two or three workers of Ajmer visited these disturbed parts of Jaipur and created a good deal of political awakening. On the request of the Seva Samiti Seth Anandi Lal Poddar contributed a huge sum to the "Tilak Swarajya Fund". With this success Seva Samities also tried to create conditions favourable to political awakening in Bikaner territory and as such tried to approach the citizens of Churu, but Maharaja Ganga Singh of Bikaner arrested the Seva Samities' workers and exiled them from his State.²⁴⁶

Students' Agitation in Bharatpur

An important function in the then political situation obtaining in Rajasthan was the agitation of the students. In 1920-21, a student agitation was organised in Bharatpur. The students insulted the pictures of George V and handkerchiefs which were distributed on the eve of the peace treaty with Germany. This was the first students' agitation of its kind not only in Bharatpur but in Rajasthan which was organised by Shri Gopilal Yadev and Shri Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi.²⁴⁷ The main slogans of the agitation were 'MAHATMA GANDHI KI JAY' and 'Bharat Mata Ki Jay'. At that time, these slogans created a stir in Bharatpur.²⁴⁸ A pro-

245. F. & P. Int., Jany., 1922, No. 17, NAI; Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

246. Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

247. Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi is propularly known as Choube Jugal Kishore, in Bharatpur.

248. Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi's statement as given to the author on 19th October, 1963.

cession was also organised in Bharatpur which marched through the streets. Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi used to propagate about the cause of 'Khadi' and of 'Gandhi Cap'. A book entitled 'Rashtriya Veena' was also published. Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi made serious efforts in distributing 'Rashtriya Veena' which was proscribed by the State. An account of the activities of Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi, as given in the Intelligence Reports, reads:¹⁴⁹

"...though apparently a reformed man himself, he nevertheless stood responsible for breeding position of sedition among the uneducated rabble of Bharatpur and is responsible in particular, for driving a number of hot heads to socialism, communism and the alike....He does not belong to this State (Bharatpur), but, like most of the other British-Indian politicians, has developed a craze for subversive activities to be launched : the Princely States, and as such, started of late coming to Bharatpur now and then to create mischief and misguide His Highness's loyal subjects."

From the first the activities of the revolutionaries and nationalists had attracted a great deal of attention of Rajputana. The seditious activities initiated by the revolutionaries in the State with enthusiasm and confidence though met with a failure, at least, succeeded in creating a climate of public opinion against the British. The movement led and guided by persons like Arjun Lal Sethi, Rao of Kharwa, Ram Narain Choudhry, etc., produced a lot of political awakening and ardour and the cause of 'Swaraj' grew stronger.

This great upheaval was soon followed by the determined deeds of the peasants of Bijolia, Bengu, etc. In the teeth of opposition they could revive the most powerful agency of the movement, Panchayat. The sense of unity fostered by the Panchayats of the agriculturists stimulated the Bhils, who were partly agriculturists and partly forest dwellers, into vigorous political activity. They, as shall be narrated in the following pages, more than any other class, were more conscious of their rights and hopeful of their determination.

249. *The Central Intelligence Bureau*, Secret Memo. No. 27, I, 13/41 dt. 10th December, 1941.

THE BHIL MOVEMENTS

Prior to narrating the history of the Bhils of South-West Rajasthan which was characterised by political consciousness it is worth while to give a sketch of the Bhils in general because it had enough bearing on the subsequent history of the awakening in Rajasthan.

Bhils and their racial character

The Bhils' are a primitive people who form the third largest group of aboriginals found in India. Their population, numbering over two million according to the 1941 census, is spread over the central uplands of the Indian Peninsula, the bulk of it being in the region covered by the forest-clad mountain trinity of the Vindhyas, the Sahyadris and the Satpuras.²

There are numerous legends regarding the origin of these people. The Bhils are referred to in ancient Sanskrit and later Apabhramsha literature,³ which throw light on their history and also on the attitude of other peoples towards these forest dwellers. The earliest mention of the word 'Bhil' occurs in Gunadhyā's famous *Katha-Sarīt Sagara* wherein mention is made of

1. The name 'Bhil', some historians hold, is derived from the Dravidian word for a bow which is the characteristic weapon of the tribe, but others hold it is derived from the root of the Sanskrit verb meaning 'to pierce, shoot or kill' in consequence of their proficiency as archers. Erskine, K. D., *Rajputana Gazetteer*, Mewar Residency, 1908, Vol. II, A, p. 227.

2. Naik, T. B.: *The Bhils, a Study*, p. 1.

3. Mahabharat, Kiratarjūmyam, Kadambani of Bana Bhatta also refers to the Bhils.

a Bhil Chief opposing the progress of another King through the Vindhya.¹ There are a number of versions prevailing with regard to the origin of the Bhil.² The Bhils seem to be the pygmies of Ktesias (400 B.C.) who described them as 'black and ugly, the tallest being only two ells high, their hair and beards were so long that they served as garments, and they were excellent bowmen and very honest.'³ But, the name by which they are at present known cannot be traced far back in Sanskrit literature. The term 'Bhilla' seems to have occurred for the first time about 600 A.D.⁴ It is believed that the Bhils are among the oldest inhabitants of the country. Colonel Tod calls them 'Van Putras' or children of the forest. The Rajputs had also recognised them as the original occupants of the land.⁵ So far as the Rajputana is concerned the Bhils had rendered a remarkable service to the Guhilot rulers of Mewar and as a token of appreciation the towns of Dungarpur, Banswara and Deolia⁶ were all named after some Bhil Chieftains. Even in the time of Maharana Pratap the Bhils' services were highly commendable. And during the British rule Mewar Bhil corps was organised in 1840 which assisted the British to suppress the mutiny of 1857.

1. Lanthoven, *Tribes and Castes of Bombay*, Vol. I, Article on Bhil.

5. According to one, Bhils are the result of an intercourse of Mahadeo with a beautiful woman. Another version is that the first Bhil was created by Mahadeo by breathing life into a doll of clay; while the *Bhagwat Puran* says that the tribe is descended from a mythical Raja called Vena, the son of Anga, who ruled his people with an iron hand and who was killed by the Rishis through 'mantras'. There being no one to succeed him as ruler, the country became greatly disturbed and to restore order, the Rishis begot from Vena's body a dwarfish as being in colour as dark as the crow, his limbs were too small, his cheek-bones prominent, his nose flat, and his eyes blood-red, and his descendants lived in the mountains and jungles. *Rajputana Gazetteer, op. cit.*, p. 227.

6. *Rajputana Gazetteer, op. cit.*, p. 227.

7. *Ibid.*

8. In this context Col. Tod relates how Goha, the anonymous ancestor of the Sisodia Rajput, took the State of Idar in Gujarat from a Bhil. Tod, James: *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Vol. I, p. 184.

9. The old Capital of Partabgarh.

By nature the Bhils have always been lawless and independent, fond of fighting, shy and restless. The rulers always took them for a barbarous community and treated as if they were anti-social elements. But in spite of all this repression the Bhils remained honest, independent and lawless and have been true to their words. During the conflicts between the Ranas of Mewar and the Emperors of Delhi 'the former were indebted to these children of the forest for their own preservation and what is yet more dear to a Rajput, they or their wives and daughters from the hands of a foe whose touch was pollution.'¹⁰ Again, when Udaipur city was besieged by the Scindia, 'its protected defence was in a great measure due to the Bhils who conveyed supplies to the besieged across the lake.'¹¹

The Bhils are very superstitious and wear charms and amulets on the right forearm to keep ghosts and evil spirits at a distance. They also believe religiously in witch-craft and there are Bhopas and witchfinders in many villages, whose duty is to find out the woman who has caused the injury. Before a woman was to swing as a witch, she was compelled to undergo some sort of an ordeal.¹² Observing on the character of the Bhils, Captain Graham says, 'The Bhils are the most uncivilized of all the wild tribes, with intellect barely sufficient to understand and totally unequal to comprehend anything beyond the most simple communication and with forms stunted by hardships, the bad climate and the bitter poverty in which they are steeped.'¹³ Dr. Khanapurkar says of them that their bravery and faithfulness have given rise to many legends. They are filthy eaters and eat all things, are superstitious in the extreme, never enthusiastic about religion or gods but believe in magic

10. Tod, op. cit., Vol I.

11. *Ibid.*

12. The case of a witch-swinging in the Kaliawas Bhil Pal of Mewar. F. & P. Deptt., Genl. I. A, Jany., 1883, Nos. 51-58A, NAI.

13. Graham: *The Bhil Tribes of Khandesh*, p. 3; Khanapurkar, D. P.: *Aboriginal Tribes of South Gujarat*, an unpublished thesis in the School of Economics and Sociology, Bombay.

and witchcraft." According to the current legends, 'Bhil is the King of the jungle, his arrows fly straight. He is always ready for a fight but he is also a man of his word and so is a safe escort. If you manage to please him he is a Bhil, if you rub him the wrong way up he is the son of a dog.'¹⁴ Observing on the Bhil characteristics, Bhogilal Pandya stated, 'In Doongarpur Bhils consist 58 per cent of the total population, but owing to their illiteracy this community has always been exploited by the capitalist and the State authorities. The result has been that they have lost the Political consciousness at all.'¹⁵

The Bhils have shown a tendency to disrespect law and order. They have often voiced their feelings against an alien Government and they have resorted to violence at all times against it. They rose against the Marathas in the 18th century and were severely punished. They revolted against the British in 1800 but the diplomacy of Colonel Tod¹⁶ succeeded and on 12th May 1825 Bhils entered into an agreement which was signed by Bainum Soorat and Doodah Soorat with the Company. The following were the main provisions of the agreement:¹⁷

1. We (Bhils) will deliver our bows, arrows and all weapons.
2. Whatever plunder we may have obtained during the late disturbance we will make good.
3. In future we will never commit any depredations in towns, villages or public roads.
4. We will not give refuge to thieves, plunderers, Gras-

14. Naik, T. B.: *The Bhils, a study*, p. 21.

15. A number of Lok-Geets are there, which express the Bhil sentiments very clearly and stress the fact that a Bhil believes in a brutal revenge. *Rajasthan-Bhilon Ke Lok Geet* (Sahitya Sansathan Rajasthan-Vishwa Vidya Peeth Udaipur).

16. Bhogilal Pandya quoted by Kela, Bhagwandass: *Deshi Rajya Shasan*, p. 380.

17. Col. Tod was the first Political Agent appointed at Udaipur (Mewar).

18. Aitchison: *Collection of treaties, engagements and Sanads*, Vol III, p. 13.

siahs or Thakurs or any enemies of the British Government in our pals (villages), whether they belong to our own country or any other.

5. We will obey the commands of the Company and present ourselves whenever required.
6. We will not take more than our just and old established dues from the Rawal's and Thakur's villages.
7. We will never refuse to pay the yearly tribute to the Rawal of Doongarpur.
8. Should any person, subject to the Company, stop at our villages we will give him protection.
9. Should we not act in the above manner we will be accounted criminals against the British Government.

New reforms and the Bhil risings

From the above account of the Bhils one feature that attracts over attention is their love for independent living.

As soon as the British Government took over the administration from the East India Company on November 1, 1858 a number of reforms were introduced in British India as well as in Indian States on British Indian pattern.¹⁹ These reforms in a way proved to be checks on the rights enjoyed by the Bhils. In 1868, Bhils of Kharwar Pal in the Hilly District of Mewar indulged in lawless activities and began to defy the State authorities. Major Mackeson, the Superintendent, Mewar Bhil Corps, had written to the Maharana that to establish peace and order it was necessary to make an improvement in the administration in the District.²⁰ State officials like Mehta Raghunath Singh and Moti Singh were behaving cruelly and unjustly with the tribesmen. The officials were charging double taxes and imposing heavy fines by employing force.²¹ The Maharana, however, at once despatched two hundred infantry and one hundred fifty

19. See Chapter III.

20. Letter dt. 20 April, 1868, from Major Mackenson to Maharana Shambhu Singh of Mewar, Bakshi Khana, Udaipur.

21. *Ibid.*

cavalry troops to suppress the Bhils. But even then for some time the Bhils of the 'Pal' continued to defy. The State troops, however, then resorted to brutal measures against them and suppressed their resistance but, in fact, this was a temporary truce and Bhils were not totally suppressed. Lt. Colonel Mackenson, the Offg. Political Superintendent, Hilly Tract, Mewar, reported in May, 1871 that the 'punishment meted out to the Bhil in 'Pal' had resulted in general pacification though the attitude of the Mewar officials had not yet changed.' Mirza Rahim Beg, the Police official, was indulgent and was becoming a source of unrest while Pandit Anand Rao, the civil official, was nowhere to be seen fulfilling his duties.' Under the circumstances the disturbances continued and at last the Maharana had to send his troops again to suppress them.²²

In the year 1881, for the first time a number of reforms were introduced among the Bhils. The main reforms were the introduction of Census, the prohibition of the manufacture of liquor and to farm out liquor contract to one man, establishment of police or customs post in the Bhil areas, ban on witch-swinging which ultimately led to the official interference in Bhil areas and with their age-long customs and conventions.²³ These reforms led to the cause of dissatisfaction among the Bhils as it was found difficult to make them understand the object and advantages of these reforms. Various types of doubts were created and rumours were spread, as soon as the operations were started by the State officials. Some of the leading nobles of the State thought that the British Government wished to levy a 'Barar' (tax) as contribution towards the cost of the Afghan war, while among the Bhils a general apprehension arose that numbering was being done to see how many able-bodied men could be recruited to fight for the British Government at

22. Nixon, J. P.: *Mewar Agency Reports*, 1870-1871.

23. Letter dt. 19th June, 1876 from the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secretary, Government of India. F. & P. Deptt., Pol., B, August, 1876, Nos. 51-53; NAI.

24. F. & P. Pol. A, April, 1881, Nos. 25-39, NAI.

Kabul.²⁵ Some thought that a scheme was being prepared to attempt for the gradual extinction of the Bhil population, others thought that fat women would be assigned to stout men and the lanky to the lean, etc., and that new taxations would follow the census work.²⁶ The introduction of these reforms, therefore, provoked the Bhils and led to the general uprising of 1881.

The report of the first uprising of the Bhils of Mewar reached the A.G.G.²⁷ from the Maharana who informed him on 25th March, 1881 that 'a thanedar of Bara Pal had sent a Sawar to Baduna Pal, to summon some of the Bhils in connection with a land dispute, that the Bhils turned out and killed the Sawar and that about three hundred in number proceeded at once to the thana or police station of Bara Pal and surrounded it, that in the noon on the 26th, news had reached him that the Thanedar, 5 Sawars and other people numbering in all about 16 souls, had been killed, and that from 2,000 to 3,000 Bhils had collected, closed the Road between Udaipur and Kherwara, and burnt the Police Station and all the Baniyas' shops at Bara Pal.'²⁸ The Maharana immediately despatched the troops, but the Bhils had left Bara Pal and taken to the hills, and thus could not be engaged. In the meantime the Bhils of Ulsigarh had also risen²⁹ with the result the situation became so serious that the A.G.G. was directed by the British Government 'to proceed without delay to Udaipur to direct proceedings for the pacification of the Bhil country' and to 'make careful investigations into the causes of the risings.'³⁰ Explaining the circumstances, which led the

²⁵ F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 25-39, NAI. Stratton, J. P.: *Mewar Agency Report*, 1880-1881.

²⁶ Shyamaldas, Kaviraja: *Vir Vinod*, Vol. II, p. 2217; *Mewar Agency Report*, 1880-1881.

²⁷ Letter dt. 29th March, 1881, from the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secy., G.O.I. F. & P. Deptt., Pol. A, April, 1881, Nos. 25-39, NAI.

²⁸ F. & P. Deptt., Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 25-39, NAI.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Telegram dt. 5th April, 1881, from Foreign Secretary, Simla, to the A.G.G., Abu. F. & P. Deptt., Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 25-39, NAI. Letter dt. 7th April, 1881 from Secy., G.O.I., to the A.G.G. in Rajasthan. F. & P., Deptt. Pol. A, April, 1881 Nos. 25-39, NAI.

murder of a 'thanedar' of Bara Pal, 11 Sawars and Sepoys, two men and their wives, one girl and the loss of seven horses, Colonel Blair³¹ stated that the Bhils of the Bara Pal and Rakavnath were all in revolt. The demands of the Bhils were that if a woman was suspected of being a witch she should be killed without any further investigation, secondly, that no Police outposts should be kept in Bhil areas and thirdly, if they quarrelled amongst themselves the Darbar should not interfere. Besides all these demands, their most important demand was that "no future census should be taken of them, as they were sure that the census was only made with a view of taxing them."³² Colonel Blair, commenting over the situation, blamed the Mewar officials that "there is no doubt that the commencement of the whole thing was in the most injudicious manner."³³ The Maharana was advised "to be most careful how they arranged for the enumeration of this class of people." Colonel Blair was assured that "no house-to-house enumeration would be attempted, but that merely an estimate would be made of the numbers of the Bhils in the various 'pals'.³⁴ In fact Colonel Blair had received the intelligence that more than this was being attempted, and he, therefore, had advised the Maharana "to issue orders to put a stop to this." Accordingly, it was arranged that the 'pals' and 'phullas' (groups of huts) should alone be counted and that, not by officials visiting 'pals' in person, but through the Gemeties or headmen, who would be able to state how many huts belonged to a 'phulla', and that a population of 4 should be given to each hut without distinction of sex. But evidently the matter had rankled in the minds of the Bhils and became one of the major causes of the disturbances.³⁵

Another subject which caused much irritation was the establishment of Police checkpoints or Darbar customs within the

31. Col. Blair was the commandant of the Mewar Bhil Corps.

32. Letter dt. 4th April, 1881, from the A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Secretary, G.O.I. For. & Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 25-39, NAI.

33. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881; Nos. 25-39, NAI.

34. *Ibid.*

35. Letter dt. 4th April, 1881, from the A.G.G. in Raj. to the Secty., G.O.I. op. cit., NAI.

Bhil tracts. In fact, this was rendered necessary by the new customs tariff, which had come into force in 1880, and intended to prevent smuggling. According to Colonel Blair, "in this matter too the Darbar officials behaved most injudiciously, and their action in this respect not unnaturally led the Bhils to suppose that new taxes were to be levied on them."³⁶ Looking to the circumstances and the serious situation, Colonel Blair had asked the assistance of the British troops from Ahmedabad.³⁷

Colonel Blair makes an enquiry

Colonel Blair, however, had conducted the necessary enquiries into the matter and had assured the Bhils that the British Government and Maharana's order regarding census were only for knowing the number of the huts and in no way about their women or their cattle. With this explanation the Bhils had been completely satisfied. The 'pals' then entered into their individual grievances, which consisted mostly of the complaints of the behaviour of the Sawars at different chowkis "pushing their women about, etc., of the constant increasing exactions of the Darbar officials in a multitude of ways."³⁸ The reason for the disturbance which was placed by the Raj officials before Colonel Blair was that "the Gometi was summoned in connection with Kulal's contract." But on the other hand the Bhils, one and all, stated that Gometi had been acting in the interest of the Bhil people, and that certain information for the census papers which the Bhils had objected to supply was required by the 'thanedar', and that the Gometi of Paduna was summoned as a ring leader having refused to give the information.³⁹ Colonel Blair, however, reached the conclusion that the main cause for killing the Sawar, who tried to take Gometi by force, was the census.

During the enquiry all the Bhils unanimously stated that had

36. *Ibid.*

37. Letter dated 18th April, 1881, from Col. Blair to A.G.G. in Raj. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, No. 137-179, NAI.

38. Letter dt. 18th April from Col. Blair to A.G.G. in Rajasthan, *op. cit.*, NAI.

39. *Ibid.*

the Raj troops not advanced beyond Bara Pal or Paduna, they would not have been alarmed, and even when the troops advanced to Rukhavanath, they had let it pass quietly, and there was no thought of an immediate general rising, believing it had been called out owing to local disturbances. But the troops advanced to Bara, a village between Paduna and Persad, where the people were all at their usual occupations with their women and children in the fields, a man crossing the road with a bed upon his head was shot dead by one of the Raj Sepoys. The Bhils' description of this occurrence was that a peaceful villager was killed 'be-kussor' (innocent).⁴⁰ Word was at once passed along the hills—'the army is coming shooting every one they meet'. This, confirmed the previous impression that the Paduna Gameti had drawn his sword in regard to the census and that the army had come to enforce the census by indiscriminately killing everybody who opposed. The Bhils, accordingly, gathered the 'pals' which happened to be in the neighbourhood, and attacked the army within a few miles of Rakhavnath, and kept up a running fight till the army reached that place. As a result of this engagement some 20 men fell on the spot, and from 20 to 30 more were seriously wounded.⁴¹

According to Colonel Blair. Sanwaldass,⁴² the State official, did not impress him with the idea that he was acting in a straightforward manner with the Bhils, for he appeared to rest his hopes more on exciting internal tends than in bringing about a general pacification; and he further hinted that any inconvenient promises made could hereafter be broken on a suitable occasion and he did not appear confident about the Gometis meeting the officials in a friendly conference.⁴³

However, a conference took place between the Bhils and Colonel Blair and as a result of which the Bhils were so much

40. *Ibid.*

41. *Ibid.*

42. Sanwaldass was with the States troops, operating in Bhil areas under his command.

43. Letter dt. 18th April, 1881, from Col. Blair to A.G.G. in Raj. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 137-79, NAI.

satisfied that 'they did not even ask that the census should not be repeated'. With regard to their other grievances, Colonel Blair advised them to have a meeting with the Darbar officials. Accordingly the Bhils, who were not more than a hundred, assembled in Rukhavanath and were seated on a slope close to the 'Chatri', in which the Raj Officials were seated. All was going well, till Sanwaldass asked the Bhils, "Why are you not going to yield anything at all" and immediately some sepoys began to load their guns. On noticing this the Bhils ran, whereupon a shot was fired.⁴⁴ In fact this unprovoked firing was the result of a lack of farsightedness on the part of the Mewar officials. In fact the crowd was insignificant, and it was practically unarmed, having nothing but their crude weapons, as such the act of shooting them down was inexcusable.⁴⁵

This incident created a stir among the Bhils and it was feared that these disturbances may take a serious turn and an early Bhils attack on Kherwara was anticipated. At Asirgarh, Kotra, Payee and other places also the people joined the dissatisfied Bhils. At Asirgarh a Kamdar and some police constables were put to death. Bhils burnt the Police post of Kewra Pass. Akshya Singh, the Hakim of the hilly district, was seized in the village of Parsad and the road between Udaipur and Kherwara was closed. The Chief leaders of the upsurge were Neema Gameti of Besik Pal, Khena of Peepli and Joysts of Sagaten.⁴⁶ Therefore, to suppress the Bhils two companies of 26th N.I. from Ahmedabad and four companies of 20th N.I. from Baroda were asked to be ready to move.⁴⁷ A proclamation dated the 21st April, 1881 was issued⁴⁸ by the

44. *Ibid.*

45. *Ibid.*

46. Letter dt. 18th April, 1881, from Col. Blair to A.G.G. in Raj., *op. cit.*, NAI.

47. Shyamaldass, Kavi Raja: *Vir Vinod*, p. 2220.

48. Letter dt. 22nd April, 1881, from Viceroy, Simla to Secretary of State London, F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 137-179, NAI.

49. Proclamation dt. 21st April, 1887, of H.H. the Maharana of Udaipur. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, No. 148, NAI.

Maharana of Udaipur appealing the Bhils not to engage with the Raj troops. In the meanwhile a Kharita from Lt. Colonel C. K. M. Waltor, the A.G.G. in Rajasthan, was addressed to the Chiefs of Dungarpur, Banswara and Pratabgarh intimating them about the Bhil disturbances in Mewar and asking them to take precautions in their respective territory and to co-operate with the British efforts.⁵⁰

But, as a result of the Maharana's personal intervention, an agreement,⁵¹ which consisted of twenty-one articles, was concluded on 19th April, 1881 between the Darbar and the Bhils of Mewar according to which Maharana agreed with the terms that the houses of the Bhils were not to be counted; census officials were not to be allowed to live in Rakhabdeoiji; the accused of the murder of Thanedar and Sepoys in Paduna and Bara Pal was to be pardoned; land was not to be measured and so on. Thus, practically all the demands of the Bhils were accepted by the Maharana.

Bhil Outrages in Doongarpur

But in spite of the agreement peace could not be restored immediately and disturbances continued. On 13th June, 1881, a number of Bhils, apparently of the Borai Pal, attacked and brutally murdered nine Mekranis and a Faqir, who were proceeding towards Salumber in search of employment.⁵² On 19th July, 1881, Dr. Stratton⁵³ was asked to impress on the Mewar Darbar the necessity of taking every possible measure for the arrest of the perpetrators of this atrocious murder. Accordingly the Mewar Darbar sent Dayalal, a Darbar official who was much trusted and liked by the Bhils, to enquire into the case, with instructions to explain to the Gametis of Pals en route what had occurred, and the need of punishing the offenders. He

50. Kharita. dt. 20th April, 1881, from A.G.G. in Raj. to the Chiefs of Dungarpur, Banswara and Pratabgarh. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, Nos. 137-179, NAI.

51. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1881, No. 313, NAI.

52. F. & P. Pol., A, December, 1881, Nos. 62-74, NAI.

53. Dr. Stratton was the Offg. Resident in Mewar.

was also directed to remind the Bhils of the terms of the Rakh-
 avanth convention⁵⁴ and to ascertain what Pals could be de-
 pended on.⁵⁵ Accordingly, Dayalal arrived at Tatora in the
 close vicinity of Borai. There he found that the Darbar 'KOTRI'
 or buildings had been set on fire by the Bhils, apparently of
 Borai. Dayalal sent for the Borai Gometis, who, however, did
 not come on that day and on the next day surrounded the temple,
 where Dayalal and his party were staying, and attacked Dayalal
 Girdawar and his party with swords and arrows. Dayalal, how-
 ever, escaped.⁵⁶ On further enquiry, the Darbar officials could
 not get the name of the assailants and the imposition of punish-
 ment was postponed until 'the Mewar Darbar becomes power-
 ful.'⁵⁷ Later, troops were again sent from Udaipur, which sup-
 pressed the insurgence and punished its leaders.⁵⁸ The Maha-
 rana got a fort constructed at Borai and put a garrison of 300
 troops in the fort so that the peace could easily be maintained.⁵⁹

Dr. Stratton, Resident in Mewar, had sent a detailed re-
 port on the murder of Makranis fixing the responsibility on the
 Bhil Pals of Borai⁶⁰ and Nathara.⁶¹ On account of the murder
 of Makranis and an attack on Dayalal, the troops were deploy-
 ed⁶² against the Bhil Pals of Borai, their huts were razed to
 the grounds and they were plundered. The Maharana insisted
 that the accused of the murder of Makranis must surrender be-
 fore the Darbar troops, while the Bhils of Borai were prepared

54. Agreement dt. 19th April, 1881, concluded between the Maharana of Udaipur and the Bhils.

55. F. & P. Pol., A, Dec., 1881, Nos. 62-74. NAI.

56. *Ibid.*

57. *Ibid.*

58. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 85-92. NAI.

59. Col. Walter: *Mewar Agency Report*, 1882-83.

60. The Boraipal is situated on the north bank of the river Soam, where the river forms the boundary between Mewar and Dungarpur. Borai itself is in Mewar (Udaipur), but it has numerous off-shoots across the frontier.

61. Nathara occupies a strong and intricate tract of hill coun-
 try, between the Kherwara high road and the Kesra route, a little
 north of the cross road between Pershad and Deval.

62. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 83-92. NAI.

to pay the fine.⁶¹ By paying a fine, the Bhils thought they would earn 'Safai' and this gave them some consolation. But the Maharana refused to grant them pardon until the assailants of ten Makranis did not surrender. Finally, therefore, on 16th February, 1882, when the troops converged on Borai by several routes not a man was met and the whole Borai was found evacuated.⁶² As a result of this engagement two or three Darbar men were wounded by the Bhils and four Bhils were killed.⁶³ A reward of rupees two hundred fifty for the arrest of the headmen and commoners concerned in the murder of Makranis and wayfarers in Dungarpur territory was announced. But the Bhils refused to surrender the accused. It should, however, be admitted that due to the military operation the Bhils had already suffered a lot as Dr. Stratton, Offg. Resident in Mewar, himself observed, 'They (Bhils) sacrificed their spring crops, which withered on ceasing to be watered. They lost also the produce of the mango and 'mahwa' trees this season, and in order to prevent night-lurking about the place, their scattered houses had to be unroofed. Beyond this they have left a location which, for a Pal, is singularly well favoured, from its extent and excellence both for cultivation, grazing and jungle produce.'⁶⁴ But, the Borai Bhils' conditions to surrender were: that the offenders be pardoned, Gameties, Phuljira and Laljira and some 25 others be not prosecuted and the Gameties be not hanged or imprisoned for life and while deprived of their Gametiship, be not imprisoned for more than a short period, say 4 or 6 months, etc.⁶⁵

63. Letter dt. 24th April, 1882, from Dr. J. P. Stratton, Offg. Resident in Mewar to the First Assistant to the A.G.G. in Raj. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 83-92, NAI.

64. Letter dt. 24th April, 1882, from J. P. Stratton to First Asstt. to A.G.G. in Raj., *op. cit.*, NAI.

65. The precise figures are: killed—4 Bhils, arrested—8 Bhils, captured 44 cattle, 55 goats, 3 guns, 6 Sowars, 75 bows and arrows and some miscellaneous property. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, No. 83-92, NAI.

66. Letter dt. 24th April, 1882, from Dr. J. P. Stratton, Offg. Mewar Resident to the First Asstt. to the A.G.G. in Raj. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 83-92, NAI.

67. *Ibid.*

On 16th March, 1882, in the morning the troops started their operation in Nathara to find out the culprits of the murder of Makranis and of an attack on Dayalal. After a little skirmishing, in which one or two Darbar troops were wounded, the Bhils were severely penalised with the forcible collection of the year's revenue.⁶⁸ But at Nathara the Bhils did not refuse to surrender and laid down at the feet of the Darbar officer a heap of their bows and arrows in token of submission. Their bond to abstain from future plundering was accepted and a slab of stone, according to the custom of the Bhils, was buried at a temple as a proof of the contract being sacred.⁶⁹ The agreement provided that the Gameties and the Baujgurians would never allow a woman being killed on the suspicion of her being a witch. If they had a suspicion about any woman, they would report to the Government. 'They took the Oath of 'KALE JI' to promise that they would follow the agreement'.⁷⁰

As a result of this agreement the other 'Pals' were considerably scared and it was, therefore, hoped that the result of both the Borai and Nathara affairs would somewhat revive the prestige and influence of State authority, which had suffered on account of the 1881 outbreak. In this context the role played by the Maharana's officials, i.e., Minister Rai Pannalal, Hakim Govind Singh, Military Associate Mamaji Aman Singh and by the troops which were composed partly of the State regulars, partly of local levies, and partly of the nobles, had been remarkable.⁷¹

The Bhils of Borai had suffered a lot since the outbreak of 1881, but, however, an agreement was concluded on 28th February, 1883, according to which the Bhils gave up all guns and swords in their possession, promised to keep no arms ex-

68. *Ibid.*

69. The Nathara operations yield the following figures: Killed Bhils 7, including 3 Bajgaricas or Dy. Headmen and 3 of the Principal raiders. Arrested—Bhils 7, including 6 Gametis or Headmen. Surrendered—Guns 3, Sword 1. Bows and arrows 70. Captured—Cattle 191, Goats 100. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882. Nos. 83-82, NAI.

70. *Ibid.*

71. Col. Walter: *Mewar Agency Report*, 1882-83.

72. F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 83-92, NAI.

cept bows and arrows, agreed to re-establish their 'Pal' on the lands given to them for the purpose and to pay a fine of Rs. 2,100 to the Darbar. They also promised to pay up the revenue of Rs. 300, to give up within a month and or a month and a half the Bhils guilty of the murder of Makranis and of an attack on Dayalal, etc.⁷³

As a result of this agreement peace and order could be re-established in the Mewar territory and the proposal to hold a conference at Abu was finally abandoned by the British Government.⁷⁴ The Maharana Udaipur also advised the British Government to follow a 'slow and gradual manner' policy with the Bhils of the country who were an ignorant race and whose deeds were divorced from rational deliberation and were always a result of chaotic impulse and extreme ignorance.⁷⁵

Bhil raids on Mewar-Mahikanta border

Meanwhile the Mewar-Mahikanta border also became sensitive due to the various Bhil outrages. In the months of June-July, 1881, there had been a number of Bhil raids on the Mewar-Mahikanta border and the Railway iron was stolen away. On enquiry, the main cause of these raids was 'the enhanced price of salt' and 'to secure the attention of the Darbar' to their difficulties. But with the help of the Sirohi troops the Railway-iron stolen was recovered in the Ider State. Fines were imposed on the Bhils ranging from Rs. 50 to Rs. 130 or cattle of equal value and a guarantee for their future good behaviour was obtained.⁷⁶ To prevent the Bhil raids in future on the frontier, it was suggested that the strength of the police must be increased to avoid such occurrences.

73. Agreement dt. 28th Feb., 1883, between the Bhils and State authorities. F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1883, Nos. 66-73, NAI.

74. Letter dt. 30th May, 1882, from H. M. Durand, Under Secretary, to the G.O.I. to Col. E.R.C. Bradford, A.G.G. for Raj., F. & P. Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 76-82, NAI.

75. Translation of a Khatt from the Maharana of Mewar to the Resident at Mewar, Pol., A, June, 1882, Nos. 76-82, NAI.

76. Agreement dt. 28th Feb., 1883, between the Bhils, and the State authorities, F. & P. Pol., A, April, 1883, Nos. 66-73, NAI.

Dispute between Mewar and Dungarpur Bhils

In April 1883 there had been an affray between the Bhils of Mewar and Dungarpur over a fishing pool in the river Soam, which once again threatened the peace and order in the area.⁷⁷ But the situation was immediately brought under control and a settlement was concluded on 19th December, 1883, and the ceremony of rendering the pools sacred was performed in the presence of Superintendent Hilly tracts, the 'Motamids' and Vakils of both the States and the members of the Panchayat. According to the agreement both sides agreed to 'abstain from killing fish in the Ara Pool and Kairalo Pool' and 'not to raise any dispute in future'. Should any one act contrary to this he will be accountable to the deity of Rikhavdeo and to the Sarkar.⁷⁸ The Bhils further agreed 'not to kill live fish, nor to drag the water, and while any fish died of natural causes they would not come to carry them away.'⁷⁹ Thus the dispute between the Mewar and Dungarpur Bhils was settled and law and order was maintained in this Hilly area.

Thus the Bhil risings of 1881 and 1882 were suppressed with a heavy hand. Victory rested with the authorities. Their opponents over-reached themselves by their unscrupulousness and their passion. But the triumph of the authorities was brought about at the expense of the disunity of the Bhils. The forest-dwellers of different regions never made a common cause. This facilitated successful operations of the troops of the Darbars and the British to suppress them separately. But fortunately in 1922 and onward a lead came from Motilal Tejawat, who made them conscious of their rights and prepared them to take a stand against the authorities.

77. Letter dt. 19th Dec., 1883, from the Supdt. Hilly tracts, Mewar, to the Resident at Mewar. F. & P. Pol., A, Feb., 1884, Nos. 131-131A, NAI.

78. *Ibid.*

79. The agreement was signed by the Mewar Gomities, Hakim of the Magra, Dungarpur Gomities and by the Motamind on the part of the Dungarpur State. F. & P. Deptt., Pol., A, 1st Feb., 1884, Nos. 131-131A, NAI.

Moti Lal Tejawat and the Bhils

In the year 1921-1922 a number of Bhil disturbances occurred in the Districts of Mewar, Idar, Dungarpur, Sirohi, Danta and other places.⁸⁰ The main cause of the Bhil agitation was the different systems of land revenue and pattas enforced in the States of Mewar, Sirohi, Dungarpur, Polo, Danta and Idar. Their principal demand was to abolish the different systems of taxation and to replace them by one uniform system throughout the whole area inhabited by the Bhils between Rajputana and Gujarat proper.⁸¹ In January, 1922, Motilal Tejawat collected about 5,000 Bhils at Poshina, of these 1,800 were armed with muzzle loading guns. Motilal Tejawat also tried to organise the Bhils from the other regions and he could successfully persuade the Bhils of Danta and Chandravati (Sirohi) to join the agitation against the taxation system.⁸² In fact all the Bhils of Mewar, Sirohi, Dungarpur and Poshina, Pal and Khalsa Villages of Idar joined him and organised a rebellion. This was the first time when all the Bhils under the leadership of Motilal Tejawat could rise against the States and the British Government. Bhils looked upon him as their veritable 'Messiah', who had come for their eternal deliverance.⁸³ The States and the British Government looked at the agitation as a challenge to their authority. The Idar Darbar issued a proclamation banning the 'gathering of Bhils and the entry of Motilal Tejawat or give him shelter or protection as an offence.'⁸⁴

In Sirohi the agitation was reaching the climax and Vijai

80. Letter No. 821 of 1928-29 (Confdl.), dt. 10.6.29, from Khan Bhadur Framroz S. Master, President Idar State Council to the Political Agent, Mahikanta, F. & P. Deptt., File No. 276-P of 1929, NAI.

81. Letter No. 821 of 1928-29, (Confdl.), dt. 10th June, 1929, from Khan Bahadur Framroz S. Master, President, Idar State Council, to the Political Agent, Mahikanta, F. & P. Deptt., File, No. 276-P of 1929, NAI.

82. *Ibid.*

83. *Ibid.*

84. Proclamation dt. 5th Feb., 1922, issued by the Idar Darbar. F. & P. Deptt., File, No. 276-P of 1929, NAI.

Singh Pathik was invited to pacify the Bhil Community.⁸⁵ The Bhils agreed to hold a conference on a particular date, which was to be fixed, and to co-operate with the State, but instead of allowing the Bhil conference, the State followed the policy of repression which infuriated the Bhils. In the meanwhile, on behalf of Mahatma Gandhi, Mani Lal Kothari was sent to Sirohi who could successfully persuade Motilal Tejawat, the Bhil leader, and Mr. Holland, the A.G.G. in Rajasthan for negotiations. But the Rajputana Agency did not fulfil its promise and on 8th May, 1922, the villages—Bhula and Balohiya—were set on fire and the police opened fire on the peaceful Bhils in Rohera Tehsil.⁸⁶ A pamphlet was circulated under the caption 'Second Bhil Tragedy in Sirohi' and the prosecution of Vijai Singh Pathik was proposed.⁸⁷ The information of these Police atrocities reached Rajasthan Seva Sangh, Ajmer on 9th May, 1922, and the news appeared in some of the newspapers on 10th May, 1922.⁸⁸ Rajasthan Seva Sangh deputed Satya Bhakat and Ram Narain Chowdhary on a fact finding mission, who reached Balolia on 15th May, 1922, and recorded the statements of a number of Panchas and peaceful citizens.⁸⁹ The Panchas explained the situation which amounted to a pathetic narration of cruelties to which they were subjected. The Seva Sangh's representative further examined about 115 witnesses who corroborated the statement of the Panchas. Besides, about 138 Bhils also recorded their statements separately. If the Seva Sangh's report is given credence, about 325 families and 1,800 men and women were killed, 640 houses were either burnt or razed to the ground, 7,085 maunds of grain were destroyed, 600 carts were burnt, 108 cattle were either killed or

85. Mr. Ramakant Malviya, State Chief Minister, had sent a telegram to Mahatma Gandhi appreciating the efforts made by Pathik in pacifying the Bhils in Sirohi. Kela Bhagwan Das: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagrati*, pp. 72-73.

86. Kela: *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73.

87. F. & P. P, Deptt., File No. 954-I, (Sec.) of 1922-23; 428-P, (Sec.) of 1922-23, NAI.

88. *Tarun Rajasthan*, dt. 10 May, 1922.

89. Choudhary, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*; Kela Bhagwandas: *op. cit.*, p. 73.

taken away and the other articles worth rupees ten thousand were destroyed during this agitation. This Bhil tragedy awakened and excited the people about their civil liberties and rights to live freely and peacefully.⁹⁰

However, in spite to the State's repressive policy the agitation could not be suppressed completely. Motilal Tejawat was still there who had shared sorrow and pleasure with the Bhils. He had now begun to dress like the Bhils. In the beginning of 1923, Motilal Tejawat again organised a new 'Aiki' movement among the Bhils of Pashina and Sirohi.⁹¹ He directed the agitation from Chhochor near Dilwara. It seems that the Mukhis of Poshina Patta under the leadership of Tejawat had approached the Praja Mandal of the Idar State in Bombay.⁹² The Idar Praja Mandal had also become interested in Bhil agitation and it persuaded the Bhils to join the Mandal as members. They also wanted to utilise Motilal Tejawat's services in this direction.⁹³ This provoked the State and British authorities. The Political Agent, Mahikanata, Maharana Mewar and the Bombay Police were, therefore, very keen to arrest him. Moti Lal Tejawat, however, took the stand before the British authorities that he had not committed any mistake but was simply doing the social and religious work among the Bhils, he further explained that since the officials are corrupt, they want to arrest him.⁹⁴ Motilal, therefore, requested the A.G.G. that he may be allowed to go to 'Satyagraha Ashram', but the Bombay Government and the Idar Darbar strongly protested against

90. Kela, Bhagwandas: *op. cit.*, p. 73. There is a difference of opinion with regard to the casualties. According to Prichard, who had visited Bilolia on 8th May, 1922, 50 men were killed and 150 wounded, unfortunately the report prepared by the Rajasthan Seva Sangh has been lost.

91. Letter No. 821 of 1928-29 (Confdl.) dt. 10th June, 1929, from Khan Bhadur Framroz S. Master, President Idar State Council to the Political Agent, Mahikanta, *op. cit.*, NAI.

92. Letter dt. Nil found in possession of Motilal Tejawat at the time of his arrest. File No. 276-P of 1929, F. & P. Deptt., NAI.

93. *Ibid.*

94. Letter dt. 25th May, 1924, from Motilal Tejawat to the A.G.G. in Raj. F. & P. Deptt., File No. 185-P of 1925.

any such move and requested the British authorities that 'Tejawat should not be allowed to go free.'⁹⁵ A warrant for his arrest was, therefore, issued. Ultimately, on 4th June, 1929, Tejawat was arrested in a dramatic way by one Hawaldar of Idar State when Tejawat came in a village near Khed Brahama (Idar) in the Brahama's temple where he was to attend a conference of the Bhils.⁹⁶ He was handed over to the State of Mewar in July, 1929.⁹⁷ The Mewar State kept Tejawat in the Central Jail for nine years without trial and without preferring any charges against him.⁹⁸ A number of attempts were made to get him 'free' from the Central Jail, Udaipur but with no success.

On 3rd November, 1935, fresh attempts were made to get him relieved. Manilal Kothari intervened in the matter. He went to Udaipur and stayed there for five days. During his stay in Udaipur, Manilal Kothari met with the Maharana of Udaipur, Prime Minister Dharmia Narain and British Resident Colonel Battham and requested them to release Motilal Tejawat.⁹⁹ But the Mewar State was not ready to release him unconditionally. The State demand was that Motilal Tejawat may give an undertaking that (1) he will not participate in any anti-State activities, (2) and will not leave the Mewar territory without the consent of the Maharana.¹⁰⁰ Manilal Kothari met with Motilal Tejawat in the Central Jail and found that he was happy. During their talks Motilal Tejawat apprised Manilal Kothari with the situation and explained to him that he would not like a conditional release. The Mewar State Government, however, again insisted that Motilal Tejawat accept the conditions. In response, Tejawat expressed his eagerness to accept the condi-

95. Letter No. 29-B dt. 7th June, 1925, from the Bombay Government to the G.O.I. F. & P. Deptt., File No. 185-P of 1925.

96. Letter No. 821 of 1928-29 (Confdl.), dt. 10th June, 1929, from President Idar State Council to the Political Agent, Mahikanta, *op. cit.*, NAI.

97. *Rajasthan*, dt. 18th Nov., 1935.

98. *Rajasthan*, dt. 18th Nov., 1935.

99. *Rajasthan*, dt. 18th Nov., 1935; Lokmanya, dt. 3rd May, 1936.

100. *Rajasthan*, dt. 18th Nov., 1935.

tional release provided his two conditions were accepted by the Mewar State. These two conditions were: firstly, to certify that he was not guilty of any offence and secondly, he will have a right to sue those people who had planned a conspiracy against him and had tried to defame him.¹⁰¹ It is said that State Government accepted his demand and, accordingly, on 16th April, 1936, Motilal Tejawat gave an undertaking that:¹⁰²

1. "I will not leave the Mewar territory without obtaining consent of the State.
2. "I have not done anything against the State nor will I do in the future.
3. "I may be awarded a certificate to the effect that I was innocent, so that I may have a reputed place in the Society.
4. "I may be awarded a certificate of a good character for the period of my imprisonment in the Central Jail.
5. "If the Government consider that I am fit for any job, I am ready to accept it.
6. "I may be permitted to file a suit against those who had planned a conspiracy against me and had imputed false allegations to me."

Accordingly, on 23rd April, 1936, Motilal Tejawat was released from the Central Jail, Udaipur and a certificate was issued on 24th August, 1936 by the Superintendent, Central Jail, Udaipur to him in which it was stated that 'Motilal Tejawat had been under imprisonment from 6th August, 1929, to 23rd April 1936, as a political prisoner and during his stay in the Jail his character had been satisfactory'.¹⁰³ After his release Tejawat was asked to express his willingness about the type of work he would like to do. Tejawat expressed his willingness to work and to assist those peasants of Mewar who do not cultivate cotton. He requested an assistance of Rs. 5,000 for the work to

101. *Rajasthan*, dt. 4 May, 1936.

102. *Ibid.*; *Arjun*, dt. 12th May, 1936.

103. *Rajasthan*, dt. 4th May, 1936. Dr. Sagnani as a mediator had also played an important role for the release of Motilal Tejawat.

start and Re. 1 per day for his own maintenance. He assured the State that with this financial aid he will weave Khadi and launch a propaganda for the use of Khadi to improve the economic condition of the peasants of Mewar.¹⁰⁴ But it is said that the Maharana of Mewar did not like his plan and instead suggested to him to work among the Kanar and Sansi of the district, who were about 3,500 in number and had become a problem as far as the maintenance of law and order was concerned. He was further asked to help Kanar and Sansi to improve their public conduct and assured Tejawat that all the expenditure incurred in this respect will be borne by the State.¹⁰⁵ Motilal Tejawat, however, could not decide upon his future plan immediately and this aroused suspicion in the mind of the Government with regard to his attitude and public conduct.

However, in 1942, during the 'Quit India Movement' Tejawat was again arrested in Mewar and was kept in Jail for about a year and a half.¹⁰⁶ In 1946 Motilal Tejawat intimated the Inspector-General of Police, Udaipur, that since the theft cases and the cow slaughter have become everyday affair in the Bhil areas of Mewar, he intended to go there to change the hearts of the Bhils.¹⁰⁷ But the Mewar Police in the first instance imposed a ban that Tejawat must not leave the Municipal limits¹⁰⁸ and later he was arrested. However, on 3rd February, 1947, Tejawat was released from Jail and on this occasion a public reception was accorded to him.¹⁰⁹

Missionary activities and their effects on the Bhils of Mewar

As a result of British rule in India, the Christian missionaries had spread all over the country. In Rajasthan, and particularly, in Banswara, Dungarpur, and Sirohi, the

104. *Ibid.*

105. *Ibid.*

106. Navjeevan, dt. 18th Feb., 1946.

107. *Ibid.*

108. Vide order of Shri Ram Singh, for I.G.P. dt. 29th Oct., 1944, *Navjeevan*, 6th Nov., 1944.

109. *Navjeevan*, 3rd Feb., 1947.

areas where Bhils live in large numbers the missionaries set about their business among these people who were very poor, superstitious and backward. Taking advantage of their ignorance and innocence, the Christian missionaries could easily convert these Bhils to Christianity by offering help in cash and kind during famine and other natural calamities. Christian Churches were opened between 1860 and 1880 in almost all the important States. Simultaneously, mission schools were also started with a view to spreading the Christianity. The Bible had already been translated into Marwari by the missionaries of Serampur in the first decades of the 19th century. In spite of all this the native rulers could not do anything to prevent these anti-religious activities of the missionaries as they feared the Christian Government. A number of missionaries came in Rajasthan in the name of serving the people but actually to convert them to Christianity.¹¹⁰ As a result of their activities a general dissatisfaction prevailed in Udaipur and the A.G.G. decided to stay the 'conversion' movement.¹¹¹

Vanvasi Sewa Sangh

Another important organisation was the Seva Sangh.¹¹² It was established particularly for the welfare of the Bhil community and to awaken them socially and politically. The Sangh was successful to a great extent in attaining its object so much so that a number of Bhils pledged not to drink and to take opium in future.¹¹³ The Bhils also demanded the responsible

110. F. & P. File No. 11-P of 1928, NAI. Miss Amelia Bhekar, an American missionary, had requested the State Government to allow her to work in Sirohi. The Sirohi Darbar had suggested that Miss Bhekar should preach in such a way 'as not to hurt the feelings of the people'. A.G.G.'s D.O. letter No. 27, Pol., 28 dt. 14th Feb., 1928, to Chartes C. Wartson, Pol. Sec., G.O.I. File No. 11-P of 1928, NAI.

111. F. & P. Deptt., A.G.G.'s note File No. 233-P (5) of 1936, NAI.

112. The members of the Vanvasi Seva Sangh's executive were Sarva Shri Raj Kumar, Man Singh, Bhurelal Baya, Bhogilal Pandya and others.

113. Kela, Bhagwandass: *Deshi Rajya Shasan*, Chap. 47, pp. 382-383.

government. In 1940, Vanvasi Sewa Sangh, Dungarpur, organised an exhibition¹¹⁴ through which the Bhil boys and girls presented a number of 'JHANKIS' highlighting the social and economic progress of the country. In 1945, Bhurelal Baya appealed to the people to donate liberally for the further development of Vanvasi Sewa Sangh.¹¹⁵

Observations on the Bhil rising

The nature of the sporadic Bhil rising was a kind of unrest due to an apprehension of being deprived of their individual liberty and tribal freedom which they were enjoying for long. The experiments in new reforms tried by the Darbar and the Residents resulted in greater oppression and injustice. Hence, by rising and defying the authority of the State they formulated a case for their liberty and even attempted an overthrow of State Governments, because they were not prepared to mend their ways. The attitude of the States encouraged the semi-independent tribes to adopt various patterns of opposition to taxes and census operations introduced by the British. Moreover, the sectarian factor also whipped up the local population, at one time or the other, thus resulting into a conflagration. Thus the Bhil rising, in a way, helped in the emergence of national consciousness by opposing an alien Government at different times and at different places.

114. *Naveevan*, dt. 6th June, 1940.

115. *Naveevan*, dt. 20th August, 1945.

CHAPTER VI

POLITICAL MOVEMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN RAJASTHAN (1924-1939)

The repercussions of the introduction of some elements of responsible government in British India under the Government of India Act, 1919, and the non-violent, non-co-operation movement of Mahatma Gandhi in British India created a demand for constitutional rule and generated a desire for participation in all matters of common interests with the people of British India among the people of the Indian States. This demand increased with years and the people of the States of Rajasthan began to organise themselves by various means. The period 1924-1939 thus witnessed a mass political movement and the establishment of political institutions demanding 'Responsible Government' in the various States of Rajasthan.

In the following pages, an attempt has been made to trace a history of these political movements which led to the establishment of political institutions in the various States of Rajasthan.

Alwar

In the year 1925, the political condition of the State was very suffocating. Being adjacent to British Indian territory, the State subjects were gradually showing politically conscious. But there was no representative assembly in the State and the laws were virtually the arbitrary orders of the Maharaja. There was no newspaper in the State of note and free speech and

the right to hold public meetings were denied.¹ Alwar State's Sedition Law was in force in accordance with which "no public meeting was to be held for the discussion of 'any political subject' or for the exhibition and distribution of any written or printed matter relating to any such subjects."²

Neemuchana Tragedy (1925)

This sort of political atmosphere led to the birth to a number of agitations in the State. In May, 1925, land measurement took place in *Bansur* and *Gazi-Ka-thana* Tehsils of Alwar and the new taxes were imposed. This was opposed by the Rajput cultivators of the Neemuchana village on the ground that there should not be any increase in the taxes as the 'people were already over-burdened'. At the initial stage, Maharaja Jaideo Singh did not pay any attention to the cultivators' demand, but when the agitation began to spread, the Maharaja tried to suppress it with a heavy hand. On 14th May, 1925, the State troops surrounded the village and opened fire on the peaceful cultivators without any pre-warning.³ Even the women folk were not spared and they were shamelessly dishonoured and insulted. It is believed that as a result of the firing at least 353 huts were destroyed, 71 cattle head were burnt and property worth Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 was looted away. Besides 95 persons were killed, more than 250 were wounded and innumerable houses were set on fire.⁴ This created a panic in the State, however, the repressive policy of the State did not change.

1. Chudgar, P. L.: *The Indian Princes under British Protection*, pp. 95-96.

2. *Alwar State Sedition Law*, quoted from Chudgar, P. L.: *op. cit.*, pp. 95-96.

3. Chowdhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 130-32. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajya Shasan*, pp. 322-23.

4. Rajasthan Sewa Sangh had conducted an enquiry in the matter and Mani Lal Kothari, Kanhaya Lal Kalyantri, Ladu Ram Joshi and Brahmachari Hariji were sent on the spot for the purpose who visited the place in disguise. Chowdhry, R. N.: *op. cit.*, pp. 130-132. The report was later on placed before the All Party Conference in 1928 at Lucknow. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 322-23.

In the year 1927-28, in accordance with his repressive policy, Maharaja of Alwar banned the entry of more than half a dozen newspapers into his territories and ordered that, 'a person in whose possession a single page of the prohibited papers is found will be liable to five years' rigorous imprisonment and he may be made to pay a fine up to Rs. 5,000' and, further that, 'if need be, he may be sent away from his motherland and banished for good out of the Alwar State boundaries.'⁵ The result was that the Maharaja became so much unpopular that he was publicly hooted down.⁶

Resentment among the Muslims against the State Education Policy: The Meo Agitation

There was a general discontentment among the Muslims of the State because of the State's education policy. The Muslims demanded that the teaching of the Quran should not be restricted and the medium of instruction—Urdu—should be allowed in the State.⁷ With these demands, a Muslim agitation started in May, 1932. The Maharaja, however, maintained that, 'there was no truth whatever in the Muslim agitation.'⁸ But the agitation did not remain confined to Alwar State, it indeed began to spread among the adjoining British Indian territories also and the British intervention was demanded.⁹ It appears that as

5. *Riyasat*, dated 14th January, 1928.

6. The Maharaja was to attend a meeting of the Sanatan Dharma Sabha at Alwar, but he was greeted there with the slogans of 'shame, shame'. The situation became so critical that the Maharaja left the place under Police protection. *The Times of India*, dated 6th May, 1929; *Riyasat*, dated 11th May, 1929.

7. In this context an article under the caption 'Alwar State and Muslims' written by Syed Ghulam Bihk Narang, Advocate, Ambala, appeared in 'The Light' dated 1st May, 1932. File No. 338-P (Vol. I), Secret of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

8. D.O. Letter No. 984/15-Conf./32 dated 14th May, 1932, from Sir Leonard Reynolds, A.G.G. in Rajasthan to the Government of India, File No. 338-P (Vol. I), Sec., of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

9. Letter dated 6th June, 1932, from Mohammad Yasin Khan, a member of the Legislative Council to Capt. Sardar Sikandar Hyat Khan, Revenue Member Punjab Government. It is also to be noted

(continued on next page)

a result of this agitation, Muslims in large numbers began to leave the State territory.¹⁰ The situation, however, became worst when the Meos of the neighbouring areas, viz., Gurgaon, and Rohtak, etc., began to send 'JATHAS' in Alwar to press the Muslim demands,¹¹ and threatened to take 'direct action' causing incendiarism, firing shots at officials and bringing about a reign of terror in the districts.¹² The Maharaja of Alwar, therefore, requested the British Government for Military assistance¹³ to suppress the Meo agitation. The British Government immediately reacted and on 9th January, 1933, the British troops moved to Alwar.¹⁴ It appears, however, that in the beginning the Maharaja was not willing to co-operate with the British troops, perhaps, because their presence, the Maharaja thought, would derogate his "authority". But as the situation began to worsen, he changed his mind.¹⁵ The British troops

(contd. from previous page)

that even the Head Maulvi of the Jama Masjid, Delhi, met the Political Secretary, Government of India, on 1st July, 1932, and demanded an immediate British intervention. Sir Zafrullah Khan, Member of the Legislative Council, vide his letter No. 2676[P]N, dated 20th July, 1932, addressed to H.A.F. Metcalfe, Secretary, Political Department, Government of India, also demanded the British intervention in the Alwar State affairs. File No. 338-P, (Vol. I), Secret of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

10. A note on the file under signatures of Tasadduk Hussain and H. Williamson dated 26th July, 1932, mentions that 'a large number of Muslims have come from Alwar and are staying in a camp in front of, Jama Masjid'. File No. 338-P, (Vol. I), Secret, of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

11. Confidential Diary dated 19th January, 1933, File No. 338-P, (Vol. I), Secret of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

12. D.O. Letter No. Nil (Confdl.) dated 27th December, 1932, from the Maharaja Jeo Deo of Alwar to Col. Ogilvie, the A.G.G. in Rajputana. File No. 43/3 (Part I) of 1933, Pol., Home, Vol. I, NAI.

13. D.O. letter No. Nil (Confdl.) dated 27th Dec., 1932, from Maharaja Jeo Deo of Alwar to Col. Ogilvie, the A.G.G. in Rajputana, *op. cit.*, NAI.

14. Telegram No. 60949, dated 9th January, 1933, Alwar Diary No. 1, from East Com., Bareilly to Gen. Staff. File No. 43/3 (Part I) 33, Pol. of 1933, Home, Pol., NAI.

15. Note dated 18th January, 1933, of Home Secretary. File No. 43/3 (Part I), 33, Pol. of 1933, Home, Pol., NAI.

could re-establish law and order soon and 'all was quiet' in the disturbed areas.¹⁶ The British Government then persuaded the Maharaja to appoint a British Officer as his Revenue Minister and another British Officer as Inspector-General of Police in the State. The Maharaja, however, agreed to the British proposals reluctantly.¹⁷

Maharaja Alwar leaves the State

It appears that the British Government was not happy about the attitude adopted by the Maharaja. The British Government, therefore, asked the Maharaja to leave the State for two years and to hand over all the powers to the Prime Minister F. V. Wylie or to face an Enquiry Commission which will look into his deeds.¹⁸ Ultimately, the Maharaja was compelled to leave the State for England where he was refused an interview with Her Majesty.¹⁹ Later the British Government, however, allowed the Maharaja to return to the Alwar State,²⁰ with his allowance reduced from Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 12,500 per month.²¹

Agitation for a better Government

As soon as the Maharaja returned in the first half of October, 1937, an agitation for a 'better government'²² in the State was started and a number of public meetings were organised. Simultaneously, the Praja Mandal was established in 1938. The State adopted repressive methods and a number of persons were arrested which included Laxman Swarup Tripathi, Pradhan Congress Committee, Alwar, Hari Narayan Sharma, Secre-

16. Telegram No. 84 dated 11th January, 1933, from A.G.G. in Rajputana to POLINDIA, (Government of India). File No. 43/3 (Part I), 33, Pol. of 1933, Home, Pol., NAI.

17. Minutes of the His Highness, Alwar's interview dated 6th February, 1933, with His Excellency the Viceroy, File No. 43/3 (Part I), 33, Pol. of 1933, Home, Pol., NAI.

18. File No. 268-P, (Secret) Part I, of 1933, F. & P., NAI.

19. File No. 642-P, (Secret) of 1933, F. & P., NAI.

20. *The Statesman*, dated 15th August, 1933.

21. *Rajasthan*, dated 23rd December, 1935.

22. Fortnightly report on the Political condition in Rajputana. File No. 18/10/37, Pol. of 1937, Home, Pol., NAI.

tary, Praja Mandal, and Radha Charan Gupta, Secretary, Congress Committee. They were sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment. Indra Singh Azad and Nathu Ram Modi were sentenced to one year's imprisonment.²³ This kind of repressive policy of the State created a tense atmosphere and Hari Bhau Upadhyaya visited the State on a fact-finding mission. The Congress President was also requested to intervene and to get redress to the grievances of the State people.²⁴ However, with the outbreak of the Second World War in September, 1939, the political atmosphere of the State suddenly cooled down.

Agitation in Sikar

Like Alwar, in September, 1924, some new taxes were imposed on the cultivators of Sikar.²⁵ This caused resentment among them and they started an agitation demanding the withdrawal of new taxes.²⁶ Ram Narayan Chowdhry actively participated in the agitation and delivered a number of speeches among the subjects of the Maharaja of Jaipur in Shekhawati. He was, therefore, immediately asked to leave the Jaipur State territory²⁷ within twelve hours.²⁸ But the agitation began to spread widely and its voice was heard not only in the Central Assembly²⁹ but in the British Parliament also.³⁰ However, in May, 1925, a compromise was reached between the Thikana

23. Letter dated 9th August, 1938, from Shri C. Krishna Ayer, General-Secretary, Provincial Congress Committee, Delhi, to Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj. *Patra Vyavhar*: Edited, Bajaj, Ram Krishna, Sasta Sahitya Mandal, New Delhi.

24. *Ibid*.

25. Sikar had been an estate under the Jaipur State.

26. Letter dated 25th October, 1924, from Aziz Rehman Khwaja to Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

27. Letter dated 27th February 1925, from Rao Raja Sikar to L. W. Reynolds, President Mahakma Khas, Jaipur State, File No. 99 (7)-P of 1925, F. & P., NAI.

28. D.O. Letter No. 549/OP, dated 28th February, 1925, from L. W. Reynolds, President, Mahakma Khas, Jaipur State to Rao Raja Kalyan Singh Bahadur of Sikar, File No. 99 (7)-P of 1925, F. & P., NAI.

29. Letter dated 11th May, 1925, from Aziz Rehman Khwaja to Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patna Vyavhar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

30. File No. 99 (7)-P, of 1925, F. & P., NAI.

and the cultivators, according to which the Jats agreed to pay the 'JAKAT' (taxes) in proportion to the harvest.³¹ But the compromise could not last for long as the authorities did not comply with the agreement and enhanced the land revenue from rupees twelve and eight annas to rupees twenty-five per hundred. On 27th February, 1927, therefore, a large public meeting was organised in which the cultivators expressed their determination not to pay the enhanced land revenue in spite of the repressive policy of the Thikana,³² till their demands were not accepted.

In 1932, a meeting of Akhil Bharat Jat Sabha held in Jhunjhunu persuaded the authorities to accept the peasants' demand, but with no success. In 1935, a Jat Mahayagya was performed in Sikar for the success of peasants' agitation which was attended by about 80,000 cultivators. The State adopted the policy of suppression and hundreds of Jats were thrown into Jail. A number of them which included Swami Narsingh Das, Master Ratan Singh and Kishan Lal Joshi were ordered to leave the State immediately. Swami Narsingh Das and Kishan Lal Joshi refused to comply with the order and were, therefore, sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment.³³ But the agitation continued. In May, 1935, the Police opened fire on peaceful peasants of Khuri and Kudan,³⁴ as a result of which it is believed that at least ten to twelve persons were killed, more than one hundred were wounded and a number of women were assaulted.³⁵

Externment of Rao Raja Sikar

When the peasants' agitation was going on in the estate, the situation took a new turn because of unhappy relations between the Rao Raja Sikar and the Maharaja of Jaipur. The

31. Letter dated 11th May, 1925, from Aziz Rehman Khwaja to Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj, *op. cit.*, No. 170.

32. Letter dated 1st March, 1927, from Mahadeo Chowdhry and Indu Lal of Sikar to Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

33. Proceedings of the 5th session of the Indian States' Peoples' Conference held at Karachi.

34. The villages of Sikar.

35. *Rajasthan*, dated 8th June, 1935.

causes of this unhappy relations were, an attempt of Jaipur Darbar to remove the Rao Raja's son Raj Kumar Hardyal Singh from his father's custody and guardianship, the intrigues of Captain Webb, a Sikar administrator, against the Rao Raja Sikar, an unsuccessful attempt on the part of Jaipur authorities to arrest Rao Raja Sikar, and the despatch of Jaipur State armed Police to Sikar.³⁶ These factors, however, ultimately led to the externment of Rao Raja Sikar from the estate declaring him 'mentally infirm'.³⁷ In this context, the Jat agitators supported the Rao Raja of Sikar and demanded the restoration of the Rao Raja and the removal of Captain Webb and of Mr. Bapna.³⁸ All this created a tense situation in the city of Sikar and a complete 'hartal' was observed.

Enquiry Commission is appointed

However, to cool down the atmosphere, an enquiry commission headed by Colonel Gillan was appointed, which arrived at Sikar in the afternoon of 10th June, 1938, and met with a deputation of the townspeople on the following day.³⁹ But the people did not co-operate with the enquiry commission because they were of the view that such a Commission should be appointed by the Government of India whose members should be impartial and independent persons.⁴⁰

Demand of responsible government under the aegis of Rao Raja

The Sikar Public Committee observed 'Sikar day' on 19th June, 1938, under the Chairmanship of Thakur Bal Singh, Pre-

36. Written statement of Rao Raja Kalyan Singh Bahadur of Sikar submitted to the Sikar Inquiry Commission.

37. *Ibid.*

38. Letter dated 24th April, 1938, from Badri Narain Sodhani, leader of the delegation who met with the A.G.G. at Abu, to Damodar Mundra, *Patra Vyavhar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

39. Commission's Communique, *The Hindustan Times*, dated 13th June, 1938.

40. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 18th June, 1938.

sident of the Public Committee. The 'Day' was witnessed with a complete 'hartal'. In the evening, in a large public meeting, a resolution was adopted in which 'the demand of responsible government under the aegis of Rao Raja' was supported.⁴¹ But the situation was, however, deteriorating very fast. On 4th July, 1938, one Police constable and two townspeople—Jaggan Purohit and Lal Singh of Kasli—including a priest were killed following a number of exchanges of fire between the Jaipur forces and armed bands of the townspeople.⁴² On 5th July, 1938, there was a clash between the two carriage-loads of Rajputs, armed with swords, lathis and fire-arms with the Jaipur State Forces and the police, who were stationed at the Sikar Railway Platform. This clash resulted in five deaths and injuries to a few. The entire party of the Rajputs was taken into custody.⁴³ The peace negotiations were carried on by Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj, Messrs. Khaitan and Poddar but they fell through on the question of the opening of the courts and the offices insisted on by the Jaipur authorities.⁴⁴ The Jaipur authorities tried to suppress the agitation and a number of persons which included some Seths and Rajput Sardars, and the Private Secretary of Rao Raja Sikar were taken into police custody.⁴⁵ All this created a very delicate situation in Sikar town. Observing over the police firing and arrests made out, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru also remarked in London. "The fate of the people in the State deeply concerns us. The first essential,

41. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 21st June, 1938. The 'Sikar day' was also observed in Bombay and Calcutta condemning the policy of Jaipur Government in unjustifiably interfering with the internal administration of Sikar and requested the Government of India for an immediate intervention. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 21st June, 1938.

42. According to the Secretary of Public Committee, 15 persons were killed and 40 injured. *The Hindustan Times*, 6th July, 1938.

43. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 6th July, 1938. According to the official report, two were killed and three died of the injuries. Two of the police were also injured seriously and over sixty persons were taken into custody.

44. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 7th July, 1938.

45. *Ibid.*

is an absolutely independent enquiry into the circumstances of the firing....The fact of the matter is that most of the Indian States have long outlived and utility they might have possessed and must be radically changed."⁴⁶

The situation became worse, when the Jaipur authorities served a 48 hours' notice to the Sikar people 'to open the gates of the town' otherwise the Jaipur officials will have no choice but to employ force.⁴⁷ The situation was, however, saved when, in order to cool down the tense atmosphere and to obtain the co-operation of the Sikar people Maharaja of Jaipur visited the town on 23rd July, 1938, along with Thakur Hari Singh of Achrol, Home Minister, and Thakur Bishan Singh of Bissau.⁴⁸ The visit had the desired effect and Sikar returned to normal.⁴⁹

However, the Sikar affairs settled peacefully as a 'result of the tendering of an unqualified apology by the Rao Raja of Sikar to the Maharaja of Jaipur.'⁵⁰ The Rao Raja also agreed to delegate all his powers to the Senior Officer whom His Highness Jaipur may appoint and 'not to interfere in the administration'. Simultaneously, the proceedings of the Sikar Enquiry Commission were also adjourned.⁵¹

Jaipur

Like Alwar, the discontentment against the autocratic rule of the Maharaja was prevailing in Jaipur State also. which first broke out on 1st September, 1927, in Jaipur city.⁵² Thousands

46. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru's interview with the Special Correspondent of *The Hindustan Times*, dated 14th July, 1938.

47. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 25th July, 1938.

48. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 25th July, 1938.

49. A correspondent of *The Hindustan Times* observed, ".....the change in the situation, which was as dramatic as it was sudden, was due to three causes—arrival of the Maharaja of Jaipur, which had its effect on the people, efforts of Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj to secure a peaceful settlement, and reactions within the city itself". *The Hindustan Times* dated 17th July, 1938.

50. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 10th October, 1938.

51. *Ibid.*

52. Letter No. 24. Conf. of 1927, dated 7th September, 1927, from A.G.G. in Rajputana to the Political Secretary, Government of India. File No. 673-P, of 1927, NAI.

of people gathered in the streets and demonstrated against the mal-administration of the State and the imposition of new taxes. The Police opened fire which resulted in one killed and 37 wounded including five policemen seriously injured.⁵³ The situation was going out of control and the Resident ordered a Company and a 100 cavalry to proceed to the Chandpole Gate of the city. At Kotwali, the armed police were separated by the crowd and the policemen finding themselves isolated opened fire, resulting in two wounded and killing a jail warder.⁵⁴ On 2nd September, 1927, at 5-30 p.m. a public meeting was held at which 13 resolutions were passed condemning the police excesses, demanding an impartial enquiry and to establish 'better government.'⁵⁵ A complete 'hartal' was observed for five days but on the assurances that 'the British Resident will himself look into the matter, the situation returned to normal on 6th September, 1927.'⁵⁶

Observation of the 'Moti Lal Day'

But the disturbances again broke out when on 5th April, 1931, 'Motilal day' was celebrated in Jaipur. These celebration prompted the State authorities to resort to the policy of suppression and a number of participants which included Gulab Chand Chowdhry, Kundan Lal and Kishore Singh, the workers of Khadi Bhandar, were arrested⁵⁷ and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.⁵⁸ Thus, when the suppression of poli-

53. Memorandum sent by Resident Jaipur—Enclosure to letter No. 24, Conf., of 1927, dated 7th September, 1927, from A.G.G. in Rajputana to Pol. Secretary, Government of India, *op. cit.*, NAI.

54. *Ibid.*

55. *Ibid.*

56. *Ibid.*

57. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 1st May, 1931.

58. Gulab Chand Chowdhry was sentenced to one month's simple imprisonment, Kundan Lal was convicted under section 118 of the Penal Code on the allegation of his anti-State activities and was sentenced to two years' simple imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 20.00 and Kishore Singh, a teacher of Normal School, Jaipur, was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 50.00 and in case of default, 3 months' simple imprisonment. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 6th May, 1931. and 8th May, 1931.

tical activities was openly being crushed in the State in the year 1937, the nationalists organised themselves under an institution called Jaipur Praja Mandal.

Jaipur Praja Mandal and its activities

The primary object of the Praja Mandal was "to establish responsible government, to secure elementary rights of citizenship for the people and to bring about an all-round improvement of the Jaipur State."⁵⁹ The Mandal's primary duty was, therefore, 'to tell the Jaipur administration in most respectful but in most unambiguous terms that the people are thoroughly dissatisfied with the present unprogressive policy of the State.' The Jaipur State authorities were, therefore, warned that if "it wishes to avoid shoals and rocks, must move with the times."⁶⁰ When the State authorities turned a deaf ear to the warning, the Jaipur Praja Mandal launched a movement and demanded that a legislative assembly may be established, right to assemble without the pre-permission be accepted and the freedom of the Press be granted, an employment exchange for the local people be established, 'lag-bag' be declared illegal and the land revenue may be written off in the famine affected areas.⁶¹ But the State adopted the policy of suppression, the result of which was that people were forced to launch a civil disobedience movement. The State, in order to crush the satyagraha movement, imposed a ban on the entry of Jamna Lal Bajaj into the State territory. But Bajaj was prepared to disobey the imposed ban and to launch Satyagraha on 1st February, 1939. The situation became so much explosive that Mahatma Gandhi said in his statement that, if the Jaipur authorities do not retract and Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj and his co-workers are not freed from

59. The presidential speech delivered by Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj at the first annual session of the Jaipur Praja Mandal held on 8th May, 1938. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 9th May, 1938.

60. Seth Ghanshyam Das Birla's message to Praja Mandal, *The Hindustan Times*, dated 9th May, 1938.

61. Letter dated 20th October, 1938, from Hira Lal Shastri to Jamna Lal Bajaj. *Patra Vyavahar*, op. cit., New Delhi.

Jail, the Congress would have no alternative but to make Jaipur an All-India issue.⁶²

Civil Disobedience Movement

In fact the attitude adopted by Sir Beauchamp, the Jaipur State Prime Minister, was responsible for the Satyagraha campaign in Jaipur. His peculiar mentality was expressed in his own letter which was sent to Mandal's Secretary on the political situation of the State. He observed, ".....the State cannot accept the right of the Mandal or any other body to represent the people in the presentation of their grievances..... The time has not yet come for this in Indian States....."⁶³ The result was that the Mandal again launched a civil disobedience movement on 1st February 1939, under the leadership of Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj. It is believed that about 500 persons were arrested including Seth Bajaj and the other members of the Mandal's executive.⁶⁴ The civil disobedience movement, however, came to an end on 19th March, 1939, when the State agreed to recognise the Praja Mandal as a lawful association and released the arrested persons.⁶⁵

Bharatpur

As early as 1924 discontentment prevailed among the peasants of the State due to the land revenue policy of the State.⁶⁶ But instead of taking the necessary steps to remove the peasants' grievances, the State adopted a policy of such repression that a number of villages were completely destroyed.⁶⁷ But in

62. Mahatma Gandhi's statement to the Press. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 26th January, 1939.

63. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 27th January, 1939.

64. Upadhyaya and Joshi: *Rajasthan Ke Jyoti Stambha*, p.

225. Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj was, however, released on the same day.

65. *Ibid.*, pp. 225-26; Kela: Bhagwan Das: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, pp. 256-57.

66. Telegram sent by the villagers of Kheri, Shahpur and Thana Eta of Bharatpur to the Governor-General and Viceroy of India. File No. 134 (2), Pol., of 1924, F. & P., NAI.

67. *Ibid.*

spite of the State's repressive policy, the agitation began to spread to nearby areas and the people organised a number of conferences between 1st April to 15th April, 1927, which were addressed by a number of prominent leaders like Rabindra Nath Tagore, V. J. Patel, Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya and Chand Karan Sarda.⁶⁵

Abdication by the Maharaja of Bharatpur

The State was not only facing the disorder and disaffection among the people, but had also incurred a heavy debt due to maladministration.⁶⁶ In the circumstances, the British Government advised the Maharaja either to abdicate and hand over-all powers to a Diwan to be appointed by the Government of India or face an enquiry commission which would look into the mismanagement of the funds and determine the responsibility of the Maharaja for the present state of affairs. The Maharaja, however, reluctantly agreed to the former and handed over the administration to Mr. Mackenzie, the newly appointed Diwan of the State, on 9th February, 1928.⁶⁷

Arrival of Mr. Mackenzie and the beginning of agitation

As soon as Mr. Mackenzie took over charge, four State Officials were banished from the State on charges of corruption. This incident worked like fuel to the fire. The political atmosphere of the State was becoming very tense. In the year 1929, a 'Bharatpur People's Association' was formed. Simultaneously, the Rajasthan State Peoples' Conference decided to hold its session in Bharatpur in 1929. The British Diwan was not ready to tolerate such political activities. On the day of 6th January, 1929, the People's Association was founded and a number of

68. Fortnightly Reports on the political situation in Rajasthan for the year 1927. File No. 421-P of 1927, F. & P., NAI.

69. *The Riyasat*, dt. 12 Nov., 1927, *The Indian Daily Mail*, dt. 24 Nov., 1927; *Karamveer*, dt. 25 Nov., 1927.

70. Statement of Lord Winterton in the British Parliament. *The National Herald*, dated 22nd February, 1928.

speeches were delivered under the auspices of the People's Association. Ram Narayan Chowdhry warned the British Diwan that 'His campaign of repression is bound to enhance popular unrest' and was advised 'to think twice before committing himself further to his ruinous course.'⁷¹ But, the Bharatpur Diwan did not pay any heed and on 13th January 1929, Desh Raj, Secretary of the Bharatpur People's Association, was arrested at his native village Jurcha and was forced to march to Bharatpur, a distance of about 45 miles, without food.⁷² Warrants for the arrest of Gopi Lal Yadav, the President of the Association and an M.A. (Final) student of St. John's College, Agra, were issued. The houses of Gaya Prasad Choubey and Lala Ganga Sahai were searched and a number of arrests were made under section 124-A for the alleged seditious speeches.⁷³ This created an explosive situation in the State and the people demanded that the British Diwan should 'quit the State immediately'.⁷⁴ But, the British Diwan, in order to create a sort of terror, banned all processions, demonstrations and political speeches⁷⁵ and a number of distinguished persons like Maya Shankar, District Magistrate, were forced to take preparatory leave before retirement.⁷⁶

Jat Mahasabha Agitation

In this state of affairs, the Secretary, All India Jat Mahasabha, passed a resolution demanding justice⁷⁷ and presented a

71. Statement of Ram Narain Chowdhary, Provincial Secretary to the Indian State Peoples' Conference and Secretary, Raj. State Peoples' Conference. *The National Herald*, dated 29th January, 1929.

72. *Ibid.*

73. *Ibid.*

74. *Young Rajasthan*, dated 15th March, 1929.

75. Order dated 9th March, 1929, from the State Judicial Secretary. *The Tribune*, dated 16th March, 1929.

76. *The Tribune*, dated 16th March, 1929.

77. Resolution dated 20th October, 1929, adopted by the All-India Jat Mahasabha. File No. 514-P of 1929, F. & P., NAI,

representation to His Excellency the Viceroy.⁷⁸ The Jat Mahasabha demanded a clean administration and the inclusion of the local people in the State administration⁷⁹ and threatened to start a civil disobedience movement in case the demands were not accepted.⁸⁰ However, a deputation of the Jat Mahasabha could succeed ultimately in meeting with the Political Secretary, Government of India, on 31st May, 1929, at 12 noon at Simla. The latter assured that the grievances of the Mahasabha would be looked into,⁸¹ but the assurances were never fulfilled.

Bharatpur Praja Mandal and Civil Disobedience Movement

In the circumstances, the people decided to establish the Bharatpur Praja Mandal and in this connection a deputation headed by Gouri Shankar Mittal met Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru on 20th September, 1937, at the Bharatpur Railway Station.⁸² A Mandal Committee was also appointed which was to act under the direction of District Congress Committee, Agra. But the State refused to recognise the Praja Mandal as a lawful association⁸³ and resorted to repressive methods. This led to the birth of civil disobedience movement in the State which resulted into the arrest of 473 persons. However, in December, 1939, the State authorities recognised the Praja Mandal as a lawful association and the civil disobedience movement ended successfully.

Bikaner

Bikaner, like other Princely States, was ruled despotically.

78. Representation dated 14th June, 1930, from the All India Jat Mahasabha to the Viceroy. File No. 514-P of 1929, F. & P., NAI.

79. Resolution adoption in the special session of All India Jat Mahasabha held at Agra. File No. 514-P, of 1929, F. & P., NAI.

80. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 6th December, 1929.

81. The remarks of the Political Secretary, dated 30th April, 1931, on File No. 679-P of 1931, F. & P., NAI.

82. Letter dated 22nd October, 1937, from Gouri Shanker Mittal to Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj; *Patra Vyavahar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

83. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*; p. 220; Chaturvedi, A. : *Struggle for Responsible Government in Bharatpur State*, p. 7.

The people demanded⁸⁴ a clean administration but instead of doing something to meet this demand, the State authorities promptly imposed censorship on the newspapers and proscribed about 100 books, newspapers, pictures and pamphlets on the plea that 'these articles carry the seditious literature.'⁸⁵ The first victim of the State's repressive policy was one Ram Narayan Seth, Sarpanch of the Panchayat Board, who on 7th May, 1931, was criminally assaulted by the police because he openly supported the peoples' demand for a 'better government'⁸⁶ and denounced 'Begar' system or forced labour. Even a slogan like, 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai' was treated as an act of sedition.⁸⁷

The Bikaner Conspiracy Case

In this context, the most interesting incident was what is known as the 'Bikaner Conspiracy Case', a case which was instituted because of the demand for 'clean administration' and because the autocratic ruler of Bikaner was exposed before the members of the British Parliament. In the year 1913-14 Sarva Hitkarini Sabha was established by Swami Gopal Dass at Churu, the object of which was to enlighten the State's people about their rights of liberty and self-government and to spread the anti-British feelings among the masses.⁸⁸ The general political atmosphere in the State was no more healthy and the State government had ordered to expel Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj, Arjun Lal Sethi and Chand Karan Sarda from the

84. Fortnightly Reports on the political situation in Rajputana for the year 1927. File No. 421-P of 1927, NAI.

85. Letter No. 287-IM/TI/29, dated 19th Feb., 1930, from the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs addressed to the Post Master General, Central Circle. File No. 203-R of 1929, F. & P., NAI. The postal authorities were authorised to intercept all such postal articles suspected to contain seditious matter in the Bikaner State territory.

86. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 22nd May, 1931.

87. Open letter addressed to His Highness the Maharaja Ganga Singh of Bikaner, *Rajasthan Sandesh*, dated 5th October, 1931; *Princely India*, dated 23rd December, 1931.

88. Statement of Dr. Sabal Singh, Dy. I.G.P., Bikaner, in the Bikaner Conspiracy Case. *The Arjun*, dated 7th July, 1932.

State territory.⁸⁹ In the meantime, the maladministration of the State came under heavy fire and became a subject of criticism in almost all the newspapers in India.⁹⁰ It is said that the State Government was very much provoked by the 'open letters' which appeared in the newspapers charging the Revenue Member, Maharaja Mandhata Singh, with corrupt methods in the State Administration.⁹¹ In 1932, the Second Round Table Conference was organised in England and His Highness the Maharaja Ganga Singh of Bikaner also attended it. At this time, a booklet entitled 'Bikaner Administration' was distributed⁹² among the delegates of the Round Table Conference and the members of the British Parliament, which was a reflection on the maladministration of the State, the denial of right to liberty and free expression. In short, the booklet succeeded in exposing fully the autocratic rule of Maharaja Ganga Singh.

This led to a number of arrests which included Satya Narain Vakil,⁹³ Khub Ramji,⁹⁴ Swami Gopal Das,⁹⁵ Chandan Mal,⁹⁶ Badri Prasad,⁹⁷ (all arrested on 13th January, 1932),

89. Vyas, Jai Narayan: *Bikaner Shadhyanttra Case—Kuchh Gyatava Batain*.

90. *Swarashtra*, dated 2nd January, 1932; *Riyasti Duniya*, dt. 18th January, 1932; *The Hindustan Times*, dated 24th January, 1932; *Princely India*, dated 11th September, 1932.

91. *Princely India*, dated 11th September, 1932.

92. The booklet was actually prepared and distributed by Amrit Lal Seth. This was disclosed in a speech by Amrit Lal Seth himself while delivering the Presidential speech in Rajputana State Peoples' Convention held at Beawar on 31st December, 1933.

93. He was an advocate at Hissar but later on started legal practice at Ratangarh (Bikaner).

94. He was a social worker and had established a number of schools, libraries, etc., in Bhadra (Bikaner).

95. He was a social worker of Churu and a founder-member of Sarva Hitkarini Sabha.

96. He was a member of the Municipal Council, Churu.

97. He was a tutor to the children of a number of high placed State Officials.

Sohan Lal,⁹⁸ Pyare Lal,⁹⁹ and Laxmi Chand Surana. Surana later turned an approver.

According to the prosecution, the case was that a number of articles appeared in 'Princely India' entitled 'Bikaner letter' in which an attack was made on the autocratic rule of the State Government, the affairs of Bikaner Municipality and calling Maharaja Ganga Singh 'the Nero of Bikaner'.¹⁰⁰ Satya Narayan Vakil and his party were held responsible for writing these letters and to send these issues of the 'Princely India' from Delhi to the subscribers in Bikaner State and elsewhere.¹⁰¹ According to the prosecution, in September, 1931, an 'open letter' under the signatures of Ram Swarup Sharma which contained grievances against the Bikaner State Railway and against mal-administration was sent to the Maharaja who received it on 21st September, 1931.¹⁰² The 'open letter No. 1' was also sent to His Majesty the King Emperor, the British Premier, the S.S.I., the delegates to the Round Table Conference in London and to all the leading English and Indian newspapers and prominent English and Indian leaders.¹⁰³ It was held that the 'open letter No. 1' was actually written by Satya Narayan and was sent for publication from Churu.¹⁰⁴ Thus, Satya Narain and his Churu party were charged with writing this seditious letter and the charges against them were framed under sections 123-B, 124-A and 377-C of the Bikaner Penal

98. He was the Headmaster of S. S. Vidyalyaya, Churu, and was arrested on 1st March, 1932.

99. He was a teacher in S. S. Vidyalyaya, Churu, and was arrested on 29th February, 1932.

100. *Princely India*, dated 30th September, 1931, 7th October, 1931; 14th October, 1931.

101. Committal order dated 10th August, 1932, passed by Shri B. K. Chaturvedi, Additional District Magistrate, Bikaner.

102. The 'open letter' appeared in the *Princely India*, dated 28th September, 1931, and in *Rajasthan-Sandesh* dated 5th October, 1931, and was thus brought under the notice of the A.G.G. in Rajputana.

103. Statement of Jagdish Prasad Sharma (P. W. 131) in Bikaner Conspiracy Case.

104. Committal order passed by Shri B. K. Chaturvedi, Additional District Magistrate, Bikaner, in Bikaner Conspiracy Case.

Code and were committed to the Sessions Court to stand trial under the aforesaid sections.¹⁰⁵

This trial attracted country-wide attention and the Maharaja's attitude was severely criticised.¹⁰⁶ No facilities were provided to the accused for their defence and inhuman treatment was meted out to them.¹⁰⁷ This compelled the accused to adopt an attitude of non-co-operation in regard to the court proceedings. However, ultimately on 15th January, 1934, the judgment was announced by the Sessions Court awarding to all the seven accused imprisonment ranging from six months to three years.¹⁰⁸ However, later on Pandit Pyare Lal and Pandit Sohan Lal were released on the birth of a son to the Bikaner Princess, and were accorded a warm public reception at the Jail.¹⁰⁹

Jodhpur

The agitation in Jodhpur started in 1925 by the Marwar

105. Committal order dated 10th August, 1932, passed by Shri B. K. Chaturvedi, Additional District Magistrate, Bikaner.

106. *The Tribune*; *The Hindustan Times*; *Arjun*; *Raj. Sandesh*; *Lok Manya*; all dated the 18th June, 1932.

107. Application dated 27th May, 1932, from Chandan Lal Sharma submitted to the District Judge, regarding the inhuman treatment given to the accused. A resolution was also passed by the High Court Bar Association, Lahore, on 8th July, 1932, demanding to provide the facilities for the defence to the accused and to allow them to have the counsel of their choice to plead their case from British India. F. & P. Deptt., File No. 271-I) of 1932. NAI.

108. Judgment in the Bikaner Conspiracy Case, delivered by Mr. D. M. Nanawati, Sessions Judge, Bikaner. Satya Narain was to undergo imprisonment for three years, and one year and six months' under sections 377, 124 and 120, I.P.C., respectively. Khub Ram, Swami Gopal Das and Chandan Mal each were to undergo for 2½ years and one year and six months respectively under the aforesaid sections. Badri Prasad was to undergo for two years and one year and six months respectively under the same sections. Pyare Lal and Sohan Lal each was to undergo imprisonment for six months. All these sentences were simple and were to run concurrently. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 17th January, 1934.

109. *Arjun*, dated 1st March, 1934. However, all over the country the attitude of the Maharaja towards the conspiracy case was severely criticised. *The Hindustan Times* dated 2nd August, 1934; *The Tribune*, dated 2nd August, 1934, and *Arjun*, dated 2nd August, 1934.

Hitkarini Sabha under the leadership of Jai Narayan Vyas and his associates¹¹⁰ with an 'open letter' addressed to His Excellency the Viceroy.¹¹¹ The main causes of the agitation were: 'THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE Marwar were being treated like dumb driven cattle at the mercy of their ruler'; there was no room for the freedom of Press; freedom of speech and freedom of association were denied and the administration had completely been corrupted under the despotic rule of Sir Sukh Deo Prasad, the Prime Minister of the State.¹¹²

The Agitation begins

On 11th September, 1925, a mass public meeting was organised in which an end to the tyrannical rule in Jodhpur was demanded. The underhand policy of Sir Sukhdeo Prasad was highly condemned and His Highness was requested to remove Sir Sukhdeo Prasad immediately.¹¹³ The British Resident, however, tried to shield the autocratic rule of Sir Sukhdeo Prasad and denounced the agitation by saying that 'the present agitation is practically the exclusive work of some half a dozen individuals.'¹¹⁴

Instead of introducing reforms, the Jodhpur State adopted repressive measures to suppress the growing discontentment of the people. On 18th November, 1925, mass public meetings

110. The other associates were Pratap Chand Soni, Sheo Karan Joshi, Chand Mal Surana, Kanhaya Lal Kalyantri, Bhanwar Lal Saraf and Abdul Rehman.

111. 'Open letter' dated Nil under the signatures of Vijai Singh Mohta of Bombay, forwarded to the A.G.G. in Rajasthan vide Dy. Political Secretary, Government of India's D.O. Letter No. 158-3P, dated 31st August, 1925. File No. 158 (3)-P of 1925, F. & P. NAI.

112. The 'open letter', *op. cit.*, NAI.

113. Confidential letter dated 17th September, 1925, from Khan Bahadur M. R. Kothawala, Inspector-General of Police, Jodhpur, to the Political and Judicial Member, State Council Jodhpur. File No. 158 (3)-P, of 1925, F. & P., NAI.

114. Confidential D. O. letter dated 21st Sept., 1925, from A.D. Macpherson, Resident in Jodhpur, to Lt. S. B. A. Patterson, A.G.G. in Rajputana, File No. 158 (3)-P, of 1925, F. & P., NAI.

were held in Jodhpur, Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi and Berar, in which the high-handed policy of Sir Sukhdeo Prasad was bitterly criticised and an enquiry into the police excesses and misdeeds of Sir Sukhdeo Prasad by an impartial commission was demanded.¹¹⁵

No-tax-pay campaign and the arrest of Jai Narayan Vyas and others

In the year 1928, the agitation began to spread in the rural areas of Jaitaran and Sojat Districts. Jai Narayan Vyas openly appealed to the villagers not to pay any revenue of tax to the Jagirdars. On 19th September, 1929, Jai Narayan Vyas and Anand Raj Surana addressed a large public meeting and distributed copies of a book 'Popan-Bai-Ki-Pol' (Rule of laxity).¹¹⁶ Jai Narayan Vyas, Anand Raj Surana and Bhanwar Lal Saraf were, therefore, arrested on the charge of sedition and were produced before the Special Tribunal at Nagaur which sentenced them to various terms of imprisonment from three years to five years.¹¹⁷ A huge demonstration against the Tribunal's verdict was staged, the Police made lathi charge and arrested about ten public workers including some students.¹¹⁸

Civil Disobedience Movement

The agitation again revived in 1931, with the release of Satyagrahis. On 10th May, 1931, the Jodhpur Youth League organised a public meeting for the propagation of 'Swadeshi' and decided to launch a peaceful picketing before the foreign cloth and liquor shops.¹¹⁹ Simultaneously, the people demand-

115. Telegram dated 18th November, 1925, from Jodhpur citizens to the Secretary of Viceroys. File No. 158 (3) -P of 1925, F. & P. NAI. An article entitled 'Jodhpur maladministration'—under the signatures of Jai Narayan Vyas also appeared in the '*Princely India*' dated 19th July, 1926.

116. Kishan Puri: *Memoirs of Mewar Police*, pp. 148-149.

117. *Administrative Report of Jodhpur* for the year 1929-30, p. 15. An Appeal was preferred in Chief Court but was rejected.

118. *Ibid.*

119. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 22nd May, 1931.

ed; that the civil and political rights of the people be recognised, 'Begar' and 'Lag-Bag' be completely abolished and a 'responsible government' in the State¹²⁰ be established.

The Repression

But the autocratic State could not tolerate even such peaceful activities and arrested Jai Narayan Vyas, Man Mal, Ganesh Lal Vyas, Abhai Mal Mehta and other members of the Jodhpur Praja Parishad on the charge of distributing objectionable material.¹²¹ However, the public excitement was so high that on 26th January, 1932, Chhagan Raj Chopasaniwala and Achleshwar Prasad Sharma were immediately arrested, and the Marwar Hitkarini Sabha was declared an 'unlawful' institution.¹²² The State officials were warned not to take any part or subscribe in aid of any political movement or agitation in the Jodhpur State, failing which they were liable to summary dismissal.¹²³ The Maharaja of Jodhpur, however, held that the civil-disobedience movement was 'destructive' and the goal of responsible government within the British Empire could be attained by methods peaceful and co-operative.¹²⁴

On 7th March, 1932, a notification was issued forbidding the people and the associations to take part in activities calculated to disturb the maintenance of law and order in Marwar or bring into hatred or contempt the administration of the Marwar State or any other Indian State or the government established by law in British India. The notification prescribed a punishment of imprisonment which may extend to six months and also a fine on any person who disobeyed or neglected to comply

120. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 4th December, 1931.

121. Mehta, P. S.: *Hamara Rajasthan*, p. 409.

122. *Marwar State Gazette*, dated 7th March, 1932; Fortnightly Reports on the Political situation in Raj., File No. 18/5/32 Pol. of 1932, Home, Pol., NAI.

123. *Marwar State Gazette*, dated 7th March, 1932.

124. Speech delivered on 30th January, 1932, by His Highness the Maharaja of Jodhpur in honour of Sir Leonard Reynolds, the A.G.G. in Rajputana. *Administrative Report of Jodhpur, 1931-32*, p. 76.

with any order made by the Darbar under the notification.¹²⁵ In the year 1934, the Marwar Public Society Ordinance was issued which further curtailed the civil liberty of the State's people.

The Praja Mandal

But in spite of the State's repressive policy, the Marwar Praja Mandal was established in 1934 to attain the responsible government and safeguard civil liberty in the State.¹²⁶ On 10th March, 1936, Jawahar Lal Nehru visited Jodhpur to apprise himself of the political situation prevailing in the State. A warm public reception was given to him. In reply to the memorandum presented to him, Nehru appealed to the Jodhpur people to think themselves as a part and parcel of Indian struggle against the British.¹²⁷ The Jodhpur State, however, declared the Praja Mandal as an 'unlawful' association. A new association, therefore, named 'Nagrik Adhikar Rakshak Sabha' (Association for the Protection of Civil Liberty) was established.¹²⁸ The Association started a big campaign in May-June, 1936, against the order of the State Government levying fees on the students in schools and colleges in the State and observed 21st June, 1936, as an 'Education day'.¹²⁹ The State Government, however, agreed with the demands of the Association.¹³⁰

In July, 1936, the Association demanded the civil rights and the establishment of Assembly. But, with a view to suppressing the movement, on 21st September, 1936, Chhagan Raj Chopasaniwala, Man Mal Jain and Abhai Mal Jain were intern-

125. *Marwar State Gazette*, dated 7th March, 1932, File No. 18/5/32, Pol. of 1932, Home, Pol., NAI.

126. Kela, Bhagwan Das: *op. cit.*, pp. 229-30. The founder members of the Mandal were Man Mal Jain, Abhai Mal Jain and Chhagan Raj Chopasaniwala.

127. Quoted from *Akhand Bharat*, dated 23rd March, 1936.

128. The founding members were Man Mal Jain and Abhai Mal Jain.

129. Fortnightly reports on the Political situation in Raj., File No. 18/6/36, Pol. of 1936, Home, Pol., NAI.

130. Fortnightly Reports on the Political situation in Raj., File No. 18/7/36, Pol. of 1937, Home, Pol., NAI.

ed for one year in the forts of Bali, Daulatpura and Perbatsar respectively.¹³¹ Only Achleshwar Prasad Sharma was left to give a lead to the satyagrahis, but he too was arrested in November, 1937.¹³²

Since the Marwar Praja Mandal and Nagrik Adhikar Rakshak Sabha were declared unlawful associations, a new institution 'Marwar Lok Parishad' was established in 1938. The Parishad started the agitation in the spring of 1940 for the 'attainment of responsible government under the aegis of the Maharaja'.

Udaipur

Like other States, the gradual discontentment against the Government was spreading in Udaipur also and this prompted the British Government to consider the measures of suppression of the agitation. The British Government, therefore, urged the Maharana Udaipur to issue a 'Manifesto' making an appeal to the Rajputs that 'they should not co-operate with the civil disobedience movement.'¹³³ The Maharana agreed and issued a manifesto and appealed to the Rajputs in particular to be loyal and to take 'a firm stand on the side of orderly Government and to do what they can, to terminate all movements calculated to defy law and order.'¹³⁴ But the 'Manifesto' could not prevent the gradual discontentment which ultimately broke out in the shape of Bijolia Movement.

Bijolia Movement

As we have seen the Bijolia movement was successfully ended in 1922 as a result of the mediation of Colonel Holland

131. Fortnightly Reports on the Political situation in Raj., File No. 18/10/36, Pol. of 1936, Home, Pol., NAI.

132. Mehta, P.S.: *op. cit.*, p. 416.

133. Telegram dated 9th July, 1930, from the Political Secretary, Government of India to the A.G.G. in Rajputana. File No. 381-P (Sec.) of 1930, F. & P., NAI.

134. Manifesto dated 21st July, 1930, issued by Maharana Udaipur, File No. 381-P (Sec.) of 1930, F. & P., NAI.

among the villagers and the Thikana people.¹³⁵ But, despite the compromise, the Thikana Jagirdars did not try to implement the conditions, and contrary to this they were raising new levies and taxes on the Bijolia peasants. The result was that the poor peasants were left with no other alternative but to start again a satyagraha in protest of the Thikana atrocities.

In order to give a momentum to the agitation, the Bijolia Kisan Panchayat invited Vijai Singh Pathik. Accordingly, he visited the Gwalior territory near Bijolian in Mewar on 18th May, 1927,¹³⁶ where he was received enthusiastically. Here, Pathik advised the Kisan Panchayat to give up non-irrigated holdings as a protest against the increase of land revenue and also to boycott State Schools and conduct their own as a protest against official attacks on their independence.¹³⁷ The members of the Panchayat gave a pledge to observe the truth and non-violence, to wear Khadi, to abstain from intoxicants and to maintain the Panchayat at all costs. Literate girls took a pledge each to teach three girls to read and write. A ceremony was carried out at which men who, as a token of devotion to Vijai Singh Pathik had not cut their hair for the last four years,¹³⁸ shaved. This provoked Mr. G. C. Trench, Settlement and Revenue Officer, Mewar, to observe that to avoid the trouble the best course would be 'to keep Pathik out of Gwalior and Indore villages in the neighbourhood otherwise it may result in a wholesale surrender of Mal lands in the hands of the Dhakars.'¹³⁹ Mr. Trench, assisted by the troops, therefore, visited the Bijolia Thikana to frighten the poor peasants. But as soon as he left the Bijolia Thikana a large number of holdings of the peasants were confiscated. The land thus acquired was al-

135. Chapter IV.

136. Since Vijai Singh Pathik's entry in Mewar was already banned under the orders dated 28th April, 1927, of the Maharana Udaipur, the Kisan Panchayat's meeting was organised in Gwalior territory. *Fortnightly Reports*, File No. 421-P, F. & P. Deptt., NAI.

137. File No. 421-P of 1927, F. & P. Deptt., NAI.

138. *Fortnightly Reports*, on the political situation on Rajputana, File No. 421-P of 1927, F. & P., NAI.

139. *Ibid.*

lotted to the new cultivators. But the peasants warned that, 'those who will take them will lose their money'. They showed their firm determination to take back their lands at all cost.¹¹⁰ To suppress the peasants' movement, the Darbar declared the Dhakar Panchayat to be an 'unlawful' association.¹¹¹

Role of Hari Bhau Upadhyaya

However, in the year 1929, Hari Bhau Upadhyaya contacted Mr. Trench on behalf of the Bijolia peasants and both agreed to the following:¹¹²

- (i) That the conditions of the compromise held in 1922 will be fulfilled by the Thikana.
- (ii) That the land revenue would be deducted @ one anna per rupee; and
- (iii) The land which is in possession by the Thikana will immediately be returned to its owners and that the lands which have been allotted to the new cultivators would also be returned after pressing the new allottees.

But the Thikana officials did not fulfil their commitments. The peasants, in all fairness, could not be expected to remain a silent spectator indefinitely. The result was that on Akha Teej (April, 1931), the peasants under the leadership of Manikya Lal Varma forcibly occupied the land and ploughed it. The Thikana and the State on their part adopted a policy of repression. Manikya Lal Varma along with 26 peasants were arrested and severely tortured by the Police.¹¹³ It was report-

140. *Ibid.*

141. *Ibid.*

142. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 1st May, 1931; letter dated 10th May, 1931, from Hari Bhau Upadhyaya to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi. Shri Hari Bhau Upadhyaya's entry was banned in Bijolia by S. P. Mewar's order dated 14th June, 1930. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 3rd July, 1931.

143. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 1st May, 1931; letter dated 10th May, 1931, from Hari Bhau Upadhyaya to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

ed that Manikya Lal Varma and Ladu Ram were severely beaten by the Police.¹⁴⁴ But the peasants could not be suppressed and again on 30th April 1931, the peasants ploughed their land. Seven peasants were arrested but were released on 2nd May, with a warning to present themselves before the Magistrate on the date fixed for the purpose. The total number of arrests by this time reached 40. But the peasants were not disappointed. Satyagraha began to spread more and more in spite of police atrocities. On 17th May, Onkar Lal, a satyagrahi, Achleshwar Prasad, an ex-editor of 'Tarun Rajasthan' and a worker of Rajasthan Gram Pracharak Mandal were severely beaten and arrested but were later released on 25th May, in Bundi State.¹⁴⁵ During the course of this movement a number of ladies among whom the prominent ones were, Smt. Vijaya w/o Shobha Lal, Smt. Anjana Devi w/o Ram Narayan Choudhry, Smt. Vimla Devi w/o Durga Prasad, Smt. Durga w/o Chandra Bhanu, Smt. Bhagirathi w/o Shri Hari Bhau Upadhyaya, Smt. Tulsi w/o Baijnath, Smt. Ramadevi Joshi w/o Ladu Ram Joshi, Smt. Shakuntala w/o Krishna Gopal Garg, and others participated in the Satyagraha movement boldly and faced the police atrocities.¹⁴⁶ A number of peasants engaged in peaceful agitation were arrested and sentenced to various terms of imprisonments and fines were imposed on them.¹⁴⁷ At this stage, Mahatma Gandhi and Jamna Lal Bajaj were requested to play the part of negotiators but both declined the offer.¹⁴⁸ Hari Bhau Upadhyaya demanded an impartial enquiry into the

144. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 8th May, 1931.

145. In this context a pathetic description has been given by Hari Bhau Upadhyaya, Editor, *Tyag Bhumi*, in its issue of 29th May, 1931.

146. Choudhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 167-70; *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 29th May, 1931.

147. *Tyag Bhumi*, dated 12th June, 1931.

148. Letter dated 15th May, 1931, from Jamna Lal Bajaj to Hari Bhau Upadhyaya. Later, however, Jamna Lal Bajaj was prepared to go to Mewar for negotiations. He also requested Har Bilas Sarda to mediate but the latter refused. Letter dated 19th June, 1931, from Jamna Lal Bajaj to Har Bilas Sarda. *Patra Vyavhar*, op. cit., New Delhi.

Police atrocities committed on Satyagrahis.¹⁴⁹ In the meantime, Jamna Lal Bajaj visited Mewar and met the Prime Minister Sir Sukhdeo Prasad. He instructed Shobha Lal Gupta to go to Bijoliya and talk with the peasants there. Accordingly, on 26th July, Shobha Lal Gupta proceeded to Bijoliya but was immediately arrested by the Police and was subjected to severe Police cruelties.¹⁵⁰ Hundreds of Bijolia peasants were arrested and their property was forfeited. However, Sir Sukhdeo Prasad, the Mewar Prime Minister, assured the Bijoliya peasants that their forfeited property along with their land would soon be returned to them. On this assurance the Bijoliya Satyagrahis suspended their movement.¹⁵¹ Thus, the State and the Thikana administration had to yield to the Bijoliya peasants' Satyagraha and returned the land to the original owners, i.e., cultivators. However, the ban was not lifted either from the Congress or on the entry of Hari Bhau Upadhyaya¹⁵² into the Mewar territory.

Disturbances in Udaipur.

It appears that Bijoliya Movement had its impact on the Udaipur city also. On 8th July, 1932, at about 7-30 A.M. the people gathered at the Peepli Ghat and approached the Maharana with a request against the taxes which were imposed.¹⁵³ It was further demanded by the agitators that Pandit Sukhdeo Prasad and all other corrupt officials be removed from the State administration.¹⁵⁴ But, the State administration, instead of admitting a deputation from the agitators, called out the troops.

149. Letter dated 10th July, 1931, from Hari Bhau Upadhyaya to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*; *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

150. Shobha Lal Gupta had given a detailed account of the Police cruelties on him vide his letter dated 30th July, 1931, addressed to Jamna Lal Bajaj. He was, however, released on 27th July, 1931. *Patra Vyavhar*, *op. cit.*, New Delhi.

151. Letter dated 1st September, 1932, from Shobha Lal Gupta to Shri Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, New Delhi.

152. Letter dated 24th June, 1934, from Jamna Lal Bajaj to Hari Bhau Upadhyaya, *Patra Vyavhar*, New Delhi.

153. Telegram dated 10th July, 1932, from the A.G.G. in Rajputana to POLINDIA, Simla. File No. 379-P of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

154. Confidential letter dated 13th July, 1932, from the Resident in Mewar to the Secretary to the A.G.G. in Rajputana. File No. 379-P of 1932, F. & P., NAI.

The cavalry was posted at the Chaugan and the infantry at the Tripolia. The troops then opened fire and the police lathi-charged causing a large number of casualties.¹⁵⁵ It is believed that about 50 persons were injured and a corpse of an old Hindu was found in Pichhola Lake.¹⁵⁶ About 30 persons were taken into custody and were confined to Jail without producing them before a magistrate. However, later the Maharana met with a deputation and the peace was restored on 13th July, 1932, on the assurances that the Maharana would look into the grievances of the people.¹⁵⁷

Mewar Praja Mandal

In the year 1934, the political atmosphere in the State was very much suffocating. The people were demanding right of speech, right to liberty and right to form the associations, etc., but the Mewar State Administration was not prepared to accede to these demands. As such, in the year 1937-38, a Satyagraha movement was started in Mewar under the dynamic leadership of Manikya Lal Varma. In spite of the State's opposition, Manikya Lal Varma and his associates established the Mewar Praja Mandal in April, 1938, which was immediately declared 'illegal' by the State.¹⁵⁸ The State Police raided the Praja Mandal Office in Udaipur and its name plate was forcibly removed. Manikya Lal Varma and Ramesh Chandra Vyas were asked to leave the State territory and externed from the State. On 30th September, 1938, Bhura Lal Baya, Vice-President of the Mandal, was arrested. In these circumstances on 4th Octo-

155. Confidential Report dated 9th July, 1932, sent by Sir Sukhdeo Prasad to the Resident in Mewar, File No. 379-P of 1932. F. & P., NAI.

156. *Ibid.*

157. Confidential letter dated 13th July, 1932, from the Resident in Mewar to the Secretary to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana. File No. 379-P of 1932. F. & P., NAI; Letter dated 8th January, 1938, from Manikya Lal Varma to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Pana Pyashar*, New Delhi.

158. Mewar State Notification No. 1932, dated 24th September, 1938, File No. 8/8/39, Pol. of 1939, Home, Pol. Deptt., NAI; Mohan Lal Sukhadia (Editor): *Mewar Praja Mandal*, 1938-45. pp. 1-3; Kela: *Deshi Rajyon Main Jan Jagriti*, pp. 240-41.

ber, 1938, the Praja Mandal launched a civil disobedience movement.

Civil Disobedience Movement

The movement immediately spread all over the State territory. The Mewar State promulgated an order banning all public meetings and associations, but a meeting was successfully organised by Amba Lal Joshi. It was attended by about 3,000 people.¹⁵⁹ The movement began to spread in other parts of the State also. On 11th October, 1938, the Satyagraha movement started in Nathdwara and five persons were arrested. However, in spite of the State's repressive policy people's morale was very high.¹⁶⁰ To continue the Satyagraha movement successfully financial help of about Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 4,000 was requested of Seth Jamna Lal Bajaj.¹⁶¹ However, the Mandal could procure some financial help from Ahmedabad and on 23rd August, 1938, the executive members of the Mandal were elected which included Manikya Lal Varma, Shobha Lal, Professor Prem Narayan Mathur, Sardar Singh Kothari and Dr. Amba Lal. It was also decided that on 15th September, Satyagrahis will be given a send off at Ajmer and will launch Satyagraha campaign in Mewar on the eve of Dashera.¹⁶² Accordingly by 16th October, 1938, 39 arrests were made out of whom 12 were students, who were released later.¹⁶³ At this stage, Manikya Lal Varma was of the view that the Praja Mandal movement may be given a new turn by way of adopting terrorist's methods. But Hari Bhau Upadhyaya opposed the view on the ground that since they have been externed from the State, it would be difficult for them to have such agitation under control.¹⁶⁴ The agitators were of the

159. Letter dated 8th October, 1938, from Manikya Lal Varma to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Payabar*, New Delhi.

160. *Ibid.*

161. *Ibid.*

162. Letter dated 25th August, 1938, from Manikya Lal Varma to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Payabar*, New Delhi.

163. Letter dated 16th October, 1938, from Manikya Lal Varma to Jamna Lal Bajaj: *Patra Payabar*, New Delhi.

164. *Ibid.* Shri Upadhyaya's view was also supported by Jamna Lal Bajaj vide his letter dated 15th October, 1938, addressed to Manikya Lal Varma.

tional flag' were passing through the campus of Mayo College, Ajmer, but Colonel Houson, the Vice-Principal, rebuked the students and insulted the 'national flag' and tore the flag to pieces. But when Ram Narayan Chowdhry lodged a strong protest with the Principal and Vice-Principal, both apologised in writing on the following day.¹⁷⁴ However, as a result of Gandhi-Irwin Pact (1931), the civil disobedience movement was withdrawn by the All-India National Congress and accordingly the movement was suspended in Ajmer also.

Terrorist Activities in Rajasthan

But the Gandhi-Irwin Pact could not satisfy the young extremists of the country. A wave of terrorist movement spread in northern India, and Ajmer became the centre of the terrorist activities in Rajasthan under the leadership of Pandit Jwala Prasad Sharma who was associated with the revolutionaries of the Northern India.¹⁷⁵ He was educated at the D.A.V. School and Government College, Ajmer. It seems that Jwala Prashad had been converted to terrorism by Ram Singh at the D.A.V. School, Ajmer, some time before 1928. This is supported by the fact that Pandit Jwala Prashad with Ram Singh and Mul Chand¹⁷⁶ had bought two muzzle-loading guns for rupees sixty from a peon in the D.A.V. School and ammunition through a licence holding clerk in the Sasta Sahitya Mandal, Ajmer and practised shooting in the Hatundi Jungle for six months during 1928.¹⁷⁷

Attempt to Shoot the Commissioner, Ajmer

In April, 1932, Jwala Prashad and his associates prepared a plan to shoot the Chief Commissioner of Ajmer to terrorise the British authorities in the city. An unsuccessful attempt was made on the life of the Chief Commissioner by his colleague,

174. Chowdhry, R. N.: *Vartman Rajasthan*, pp. 163-66.

175. There is a long list of 43 persons, all terrorists associated with Pt. Jwala Prashad. Arjun Lal Sethi, Vijai Singh Pathik were pre-eminent. *History sheet of Pt. Jwala Prashad*, File No. K. W. to 44/63, Home, Pol., National Archives of India, New Delhi (NAI).

176. A member of the terrorist party.

177. *History sheet of Pt. Jwala Prashad: op. cit.*, NAI.

Ram Chandra Bapat.¹⁷⁸ which created a panic in the city. But, however, Bapat was arrested and convicted under section 307 of the I.P.C.¹⁷⁹

Attempt to Loot the peon of the Government College, Ajmer

As the terrorist party was short of funds, Jwala Prashad with his associates, Jagdish Dutt, Madan Gopal, Hem Chandra and Ram Chandra Bapat prepared a plan to rob the peon of Government College, Ajmer when he would be bringing the pay of the staff from the Imperial Bank.¹⁸⁰ According to the plan, Hem Chand was deputed with a revolver to push down the peon and he was to be followed by Jwala Prashad who was to snatch the money-bag from the peon. Jwala Prashad was also armed with a pistol. Ram Chandra Bapat and Madan Gopal were deputed to run away with the money. Jagdish Dutt was to stand at some distance to inform the colleagues if the police were sighted following them. Accordingly, the members of the party changed their dresses and positioned themselves near the office of the Ajmer Educational Board.¹⁸¹ The peon came with the money. He was pushed by Hem Chand, but Jwala Prashad could not snatch the money bag. Ram Chandra Bapat shouted to Hem Chand, 'snatch it away', but he also could not. Just then the Treasure escorted by the police came out from the Imperial Bank. As soon as Pandit Jwala Prashad and his associates saw the police, they ran away, and thus the plan fizzled out.¹⁸²

Attempt on the Life of H.E. the Viceroy in Bikaner

In the beginning of 1934, Jwala Prashad again prepared a

178. Letter No. 920, I, Conf. 32, dated 3rd May, 1932, from the A.G.G. in Raj. to Government of India, File No. 18/7/32, Pol. of 1932, Home, Pol., NAI.

179. Police Report dated nil File No. 44/7, 39, Pol. of 1939, Home, Pol., NAI.

180. Statement of Jagdish Dutt dated 9th July, 1935, before the Ajmer Police, File No. k.w. to 44/63/35, Home, Pol., NAI.

181. Statement of Jagdish Dutt dated 9th July, 1935: *op. cit.*, NAI.

182. *Ibid.*

plan to kill His Excellency the Viceroy during his visit to the Bikaner State. Jwala Prashad asked his associates to manage two revolvers for him¹⁸³ and for this purpose gave a letter for Sheo Dayal Goyal at Neemuch. After the arrangements had been made Jwala Prashad along with Ram Chandra Bapat went to Bikaner to kill His Excellency the Viceroy, but the plan could not be implemented due to the strict vigilance exercised by the police.¹⁸⁴

Mayo College Bomb Case

Again in the middle of 1934, the Viceroy was to pass through Ajmer, and it was suspected that the police would make some searches in connection with the arrangements for the protection of His Excellency the Viceroy. Jwala Prashad, therefore, decided that the fire arms of the party should be stacked away at some safer place¹⁸⁵ and for this purpose the out-houses of Mayo College which were lying vacant on account of the summer vacation were selected. The work was entrusted to Fateh Chand, who carried three bags containing the fire arms on his cycle to the Mayo College. He entered into the College premises by the back avenue, leaving the cycle near the fencing, and placed the bags inside an out-house and locked the door.¹⁸⁶ He informed Jwala Prashad accordingly on the following day. But after six or seven days the arms were recovered from the out-house. Fateh Chand was arrested as 'a leave application form signed by him' was recovered along with the fire arms. By mistake the fire arms which were given to Fateh Chand loosely were wrapped by Jwala Prashad in a hurry with the former's leave application form. The result was that the culprits were

183. Statement of source 'C' before the Police, File No. k.w. to 44/63/35, Home, Pol., NAI.

184. *Ibid.*

185. Statement of Fateh Chand dated 26th June, 1935, before the Ajmer Police, k.w. to 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

186. Statement of Fateh Chand, dated 26th June, 1935. *op-cit.*, NAI.

traced out and Fatch Chand and Lalu alias Narain¹⁸⁷ were arrested and kept in Jail for about a year and a half.¹⁸⁸

Threatening letter to Suraj Bux Ghiya of Jaipur

As the party was running short of funds, Jwala Prashad and his associates Ram Das, Sher Singh and Sualal drafted a threatening letter which was sent through Sher Singh to Seth Suraj Bux Ghiya in Govind-Rajiyon-Ka-Rasta, Jaipur city. In this letter a sum of Rupees five hundred was demanded and Seth Ghiya was asked to place the money in the Arya Samaj temple on the same day, failing which he was threatened with dire consequences.¹⁸⁹ But Suraj Bux did not comply with this demand. The next morning Sualal was sent to him, but he refused to give any money.¹⁹⁰ In the mean time the police was informed and thus the plan fizzled out.

But again an attempt was made in collaboration with Baba Nar Singh Das and Karmanand of Jaipur, to commit a dacoity somewhere in Shekhawati but here too the plan could not be successful as some one informed the C.I.D.¹⁹¹

Dogra Shooting Case

The terrorists wrath then fell on the Police. On April 4, 1935 at about 11.00 p.m. Mr. P. A. Dogra, Deputy Superintendent of Police (C.I.D.), Ajmer, and Mr. Khaliluddin, Sub-Inspector, C.I.D., were fired at and wounded in Ajmer.¹⁹² On enquiries it was revealed that Jwala Prashad master-minded the conspiracy. The terrorists decided to kill Mr. Dogra because of his pro-

187. Lalu alias Narain was the Chowkidar of Mayo College, Ajmer.

188. Police Report, File, No. k.w. to 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

189. Statement of source 'C' dated 7th June, 1935, before the Ajmer Police, File No. k.w. to 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

190. *Ibid.*

191. *Ibid.*

192. Mr. P. A. Dogra, a Punjabi Officer, was lent to Ajmer for the purpose of reorganising and putting on a satisfactory basis the Ajmer C.I.D. Deptt.

British activities. As such, two days before the outrage Jwala Prashad contacted his colleague Mangi Lala in Ajmer Dharam-shala and suggested that he should take Mr. Dogra to a movie. On 4th April, 1935, Ram Singh, Hem Chandra and one more colleague reached Ajmer and it was decided that Ram Singh would shoot Mr. Dogra while he was on his way back from the Cinema.¹⁹³ Accordingly, Mangi Lal and Ramesh Chanra Vyas, a terrorist and a local press reporter, suggested to Mr. Dogra that they should go to a movie¹⁹⁴ as Jauher-e-Shamsher, the movie, was quite interesting. Mr. Dogra agreed and went to the movie along with Mr. Khaliluddin and Mangi Lal. Having witnessed the movie Mr. Dogra and Sub-Inspector Khaliluddin were cycling home, leaving Mangi Lal at the Cinema. On the way, Ram Singh stepped out in front of Mr. Dogra, fired at him with the revolver and hit him in the arm. Mr. Dogra fell off his cycle knocking Khaliluddin. Two more shots were then fired by Ram Singh and Hem Chandra at Mr. Dogra. The Sub-Inspector was also hit by one shot in the arm. When Ram Singh was arrested, he deposed that just before the assault on Mr. Dogra, Jwala Prashad met him (Ram Singh) outside the Railway Institute around 8.00 p.m. and having done so, left him to commit the outrage. On 7th April, Jwala Prashad told Ram Singh that he had got the revolver from a 'friend' to whom Ram Singh gave it after committing the outrage.¹⁹⁵

Arrest of Jwala Prashad

These activities show that Jwala Prashad was not only associated with the terrorist activities but was the master mind behind all the conspiracies. On 29th April, 1935, he was, therefore, arrested under the Punjab Criminal Law Amendent Act of 1932, and was kept in the Police custody until 29th May, 1935, when he was transferred to a magisterial lock-up, where

193. File No. 45/6/35, Pol. of 1935, Home, Pol., NAI.

194. Statement of Mangi Lal, dated 7th April, 1935, File No. 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

195. Statement of Ram Singh and Hem Chandra, dated 3rd May, 1935, File No. k.w. to 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

he was kept till 23rd September, 1935.¹⁹⁶ But when Jwala Prashad was in the Police custody he asked his brother Kalicharan, to provide him with a 'Cigaratte case and Cigaratte', i.e., a 'Revolver' on 14 or 15th May, 1935, between 12 to 2 in the night,¹⁹⁷ and sent a threatening 'Red Letter' to the Deputy Superintendent of Police (C.I.D.), Mr. Mumtaz Hussain, asking him to release all the arrested persons 'without any delay and without any condition' otherwise the Deputy Superintendent of Police will meet with the same fate as Mr. Dogra.¹⁹⁸ Under the circumstances the A.G.G. in Rajasthan reported that Jwala Prashad 'is a most dangerous terrorist and he should not be set free' and may, therefore, be interned under Regulation III of 1818 and should be kept outside Ajmer,¹⁹⁹ as it was feared that his presence in Ajmer might create a law and order problem. Accordingly, a warrant under the aforesaid Regulation was issued on 12th September, 1935, and Jwala Prashad was transferred to Delhi Jail.²⁰⁰

Release of Jwala Prashad and the reception accorded at Ajmer

In November, 1938, the Government of India decided to release Jwala Prashad on the condition that he will not directly or indirectly associate himself with any violent method in politics or with any organisation which has violence as its object

196. D.O. letter No. 1024-C/A-S-confd./35 dated 15th August, 1935, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Deptt., File No. 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

197. Translation of a letter dt. nil from Jwala Prashad to his brother Kalicharan. Jwala Prashad gave the instructions to his brother in detail as to how the revolver will be placed in the latrine of the Police Station. He also sent a sketch of the latrine indicating the place and spot where the revolver was to be placed. File No. k.w. to 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

198. 'Red Letter' addressed to Dy. S. P. (CID), Ajmer, intercepted by the Police k.w. to 44/63/35, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

199. D.O. letter No. 1024-C/9-A, Confd., 35, dated 15th April, 1935, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer, to the Secy., Govt. of India: *op. cit.*, NAI.

200. Govt. of India Order dt. 5th Oct., '35. File No. 44/63/35, Pol. of 1935, Home, Pol., NAI.

and will not enter in Delhi Province except with the Chief Commissioner's permission.²⁰¹ But Jwala Prashad refused the conditional release and started a hunger-strike.²⁰² He intimated to Mahatma Gandhi that 'he has rejected the humiliating condition which Government had offered.'²⁰³ However, on the intervention of Mahatma Gandhi, Jwala Prashad was set at liberty,²⁰⁴ and was released on 19th March, 1939, from Delhi Jail.²⁰⁵

On 22nd March, 1939, when Jwala Prashad arrived at Ajmer, he was given a warm reception at the Railway Station.²⁰⁶ Jwala Prashad was taken in procession from the Railway station to Ghasiram's Dharamshala via Station Road, Mohalla Kaiserganj and Madar Gate, etc. Mangi Lal, Sita Ram Vakil, Jagannath, Radhaballabh and Shyam Behari Singh led the crowd amid shouts of 'Inqilab Zindabad', 'Release Ram Singh, Release Ram Chandra Bapat', and cheers for Bhagat Singh, Raj Guru, Mahatma Gandhi, Jawahar Lal Nehru. Swami Kumaranand embraced Jwala Prashad at Ghasi Ram's Dharamshala.²⁰⁷

On the evening of 22nd March, 1939, a large meeting was organised to congratulate Jwala Prashad on his release which was presided over by Jai Narain Vyas. Speeches were made by Baba Nar Singh Das, Secretary, Provincial Congress Commit-

201. D.O. letter No. 44/9/38, Pol., dated 18th Nov., 1938, from F. M. Puckle, Home Deptt., Govt. of India, to J.A. Laithwaite, Private Secy. to Governor-General of India, File No. 44/9/38, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

202. Letter dated 16th Feb., 1939, from Jwala Prashad to the Home Member, Govt. of India, File No. 44/9/38, Pol., Home, Pol.; NAI.

203. Letter dated 16th Feb., 1939, from Jwala Prashad and other State prisoners to Mahatma Gandhi, File No. 44/9/38, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

204. Letter dated 18th March, 1939, from F. H. Puckle, Secy. to Govt. of India to the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, File No. 44/9/38, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

205. Letter No. 98/C dated 21st March, 1939, from the Dy. Commissioner Delhi to Chief Commissioner, Delhi. File No. 44/9/38-Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

206. Confdl. Report sent by Supdt. of Police, Ajmer. File No. 44/7/38, Pol., Home, Pol., NAI.

207. *Ibid.*

tee, Ajmer, Dr. J. N. Mukherjee, Swami Kumaranand, General Secretary, Town Congress Committee, Beawar, Ramji Lal, Convener, Political Prisoners Release Committee, Ajmer, and by Radha-Ballabh.²⁰⁸ In his most thought provoking speech Baba Nar Singh Dass envied the spirit of patriotism of the Germans and Italians and wished that 'Indians would learn a lesson from them'. He appealed to the people to follow the example of Jwala Prashad and to endeavour to achieve freedom by peaceful means.²⁰⁹ In the end a resolution was passed expressing pleasure on the unconditional release of Pandit Jwala Prashad.²¹⁰

When the terrorist activities were at their height, in the year 1939, the second world war broke out and in response to the call of Mahatma Gandhi, the Satyagraha movement was suspended in British India as well as in the States of Rajasthan. Once again, the Indian Princes came to the rescue of the British Empire and helped it with all their resources in men and material.

208. Condl. Report sent by Supdt. of Police, Ajmer: *op. cit.*, NAI.

209. *Ibid.*

210. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER VII

AWAKENING AND THE MERGER

(1939-1947)

The establishment of Praja Mandals and other Political institutions had given rise to the demand of 'responsible government' in the various States of Rajasthan. But, the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 temporarily suspended the agitations in British India as well as in Indian States. Unfortunately Indian princes could not realise the gravity of the situation. They, on the contrary, were of the view that only the protection of the British authorities could help them to maintain their autocratic rule in the States.

The Outbreak of War and the Attitude of the Princes of Rajasthan

When in August, 1939, war with Germany appeared imminent, His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner was the first among the ruling princes of India to telegraph His Imperial Majesty the King Emperor and also to His Excellency the Viceroy, 'placing his sword and personal services and those of his troops and the entire resources of the State at the command of His Majesty and his Empire.'¹ On the outbreak of the War on 3rd September, 1939, His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner reiterated his offer to His Imperial Majesty in a cablegram and

1. The message dated 26th August, 1939, of His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner. *Bikaner and the War* (A Bikaner Government publication, 1912), Abu-collection, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, pp. 1-2.

wished that 'Almighty will vouchsafe a conclusive victory in this titanic struggle'.² His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner further requested His Excellency the Viceroy to permit him to proceed at least to the Middle-East and in active service. The Maharaja and the Heir-apparent were allowed and, accordingly, the Party left Bikaner on 23rd October, 1941, and sailed in convoy from Bombay on 29th October, 1941.³ In the meantime, 'Ganga Risala', the famous Bikaner Camel Corps, proceeded on active service.

Similarly, the other States of Rajasthan, viz., Jaipur, Jodhpur, Udaipur, Alwar, Bharatpur, Dholpur, and Kota, etc., also contributed in cash and kind. The Maharaja of Jaipur placed his services and the resources of the State at the disposal of the British Government and requested His Excellency the Viceroy to allow him to go to the war front.⁴ Similarly, the Jodhpur Maharaja offered his aerodromes for training of pilots there,⁵ and the incorporation of Jodhpur Sardar Risala in the 1st Cavalry Brigade.⁶ The Maharana Udaipur announced a contribution of Rs. 75,000 towards war fund from 1st October, 1940 till the end of the war.⁷ The Maharaja of Dholpur expressed the desire to give a weekly award to the best airman for taking part in the war.⁸

While the rulers of the Rajputana States were enthusiastic for rendering all possible help to the British the people in general were preparing for organising Satyagraha movement. In the beginning of 1940, as a result of Mahatma Gandhi's call for 'individual satyagraha movement' Political agitation for responsible government was revived in the States of Rajasthan. The States

2. Cablegram dated 4th September, 1939, from Maharaja Bikaner to His Imperial Majesty the King Emperor. *Bikaner and the War*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

3. *Bikaner and the War*, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

4. File No. 46-W of 1939, F. & P., NAI.

5. File No. 100-W of 1939, F. & P., NAI.

6. File No. 85 (57)-W of 1939, F. & P., NAI.

7. File No. 30 (7)-W of 1939, F. & P., NAI.

8. File No. 76 (55)-W of 1939, F. & P., NAI.

of Rajasthan whole-heartedly participated in the 'Quit India' movement of 1942. This was the period when the public enthusiasm was at the peak. Almost in every State a demand for the 'responsible government' or 'popular government' was made. The States resorted to repressive policy to stamp out the Satyagraha movements, but their attempts failed. In the following pages, an attempt has been made to trace the history of these political movements which led to the establishment of popular governments in various States of Rajasthan.

Ajmer

Being a British Indian territory, Ajmer continued to be a centre of hectic political activities in Rajasthan. On 26th January, 1940, people decided to celebrate the Independence Day, but the permission for holding a public meeting in the Town Hall was refused by the Municipal Chairman under orders of the District Magistrate.⁹ When the orders were defied, and students shouted the slogans like, 'Down with tyrannical government', 'Down with the British Government', 'Down with the C.I.D. Dogs,' 'Down with the Government Servants', 'Down with the Union Jack,' and 'Up, up with the National Flag', a number of students were arrested and 12 of them were made to furnish securities of Rs. 5,000 each under section 112 Cr.P.C.¹⁰ The British Government continued its repressive policies and in February, 1940, the office of the Provincial Congress Committee, Ajmer, and the houses of Pandit Jwala Prashad, Dr. J. N. Mukherjee and Baba Nar Singh Das were searched for storing revolvers and cartridges. Devi Prasad, Rameshwar and Shyam Behari Singh were arrested. Later the first two were released

9. Report sent by the Secretary, Town Congress Committee, Ajmer, to the office of the P.C.C., Ajmer-Merwara, File No. 4/3/40, Pol. (I) of 1940, Home, Pol., NAI.

10. According to the official report, 15 persons were arrested including five young students namely Mohindra, Shyam Sunder, Mahadev, Raj Narayan and Radhey Shyam. They tendered apologies which were accepted and no securities were demanded. File No. 4/3/40, Pol. (I) of 1940, Home, Pol., NAI.

but the third was kept in jail without trial.¹¹ On 10th April, 1940, a warrant of search under section 124 of the Defence of India Rules, 1932, was issued for the house and Amar Printing Press of Amba Lal Mathur as there was an information that some copies of the book entitled 'Us par Roshni', a proscribed book, were lying in his press.¹²

Hauling down of Congress Flag

In this heated atmosphere, Congress celebrated 'National week' (which included the Jalianwala Bagh anniversary) in Ajmer from 8th April to 16th April, 1940.¹³ The main feature of the celebrations was an exhibition of 'Khadi' or home-spun products. The organisers of the exhibition erected a flag-staff, about 50 feet high, from which the Congress flag flew.¹⁴ The exhibition attracted considerable crowds and a series of meetings were held to commemorate the National week. Shrimati Parbati Devi Deedwania, a woman political worker from Delhi, during the course of her speech reminded the youths of India about the sacrifices made by them in Jalianwala Bagh and said that 'the blood stained earth of that place was distributed throughout India as a mark of respect to the martyrs.'¹⁵ The British bureaucracy could not tolerate these peaceful activities and the Commissioner issued an order under section 144 addressed by name to the Secretaries of the exhibition committee, directing them to remove the flag and flag-staff within one hour and to refrain from re-erecting them within 400 yards of the fort walls.¹⁶ But Krishna Gopal Garg, one of the Secretaries of

11. Baba Nar Singh Das was also arrested under section 39 of the Defence of India Act, on 8th April, 1940. Report sent by Secretary, Town Congress Committee, Ajmer, *op. cit.*, NAI.

12. The police captured 17 copies of 'Us par Roshni' during the search. Police Report dated 30th April, 1940. 'Miran', July-August, 1958 Ajmer.

13. J. F. Coulin, Superintendent of Police, Ajmer's Report dated 28th May, 1940. File No. 4/3/40. Pol.(I), of 1940, Home, Pol., NAI.

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*

the exhibition, refused to obey the order. Thereupon, the Police, under the orders of the Commissioner, removed the flag-staff.¹⁷ Krishna Gopal Garg was prosecuted under section 188 I.P.C. and was sentenced to four months' rigorous imprisonment.¹⁸ In the meantime, Mahatma Gandhi was apprised of the situation. He, however, advised the Congress workers to 'submit to the order.'¹⁹ Criticising the order of the Commissioner of removing the flag, Mahatma Gandhi observed, ".....It is hard to beat the unblushing distortions by the Commissioner, Ajmer. He has not added to the British prestige.....It may be argued that the Commissioner of Ajmer is no worse than many such officials who do much worse things with impunity....."²⁰

But British bureaucracy did not pay any heed to Mahatma Gandhi's advice and when on 28th April, 1940, the monthly flag salutation ceremony by the City Congress was to take place in the compound of the Town Hall, just two hours before the time fixed for the flag hoisting, Durga Prasad Chowdhry, the City Congress Secretary, was served with a notice under the orders of District Magistrate prohibiting the ceremony and the meeting.²¹

Strike in Railway Workshop

These underhand measures of the British government aroused public resentment, and to register a protest against the said policy about ten thousand workers in the Railway workshop, Ajmer, went on a sit-down strike on 15th August, 1941.²² The

17. *Ibid.*

18. Telegram dated 17th February, 1941, from Shrimati Shakuntla Devi, wife of Krishna Gopal Garg, to Home Member, Delhi. File No. 4/3/40, Pol.(I) of 1940.

19. *Harijan*, dated 20th April, 1940.

20. *Harijan*, dt. 11th May, 1940.

21. File No. 4/3/40, Pol.(I) of 1940, Home, Pol., NAI.

22. It is believed that Pandit Jwala Prashad Sharma, who was then the General Secretary of the Railway Workshop Union, instigated the workers to go on a sit-down strike. D.O. letter No. 85 (C). A.F. 036/41, dated 26th August, 1941 from the Resident to the Home Dept., Government of India. File No. 12/7/41, Pol.(I), of 1941, Home, Pol., NAI.

army was called. The strike was, however, withdrawn on 3rd September, 1941.²³

Arrest of Pandit Jwala Prashad Sharma and his escape from Ajmer Central Jail

The involvement of Pandit Jwala Prashad Sharma in the strike in Railway workshop and his past record of the terrorist activities prompted the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer, to issue an order of his arrest under Rule 26(1)(b) of the Defence of India Rules. He was, accordingly, arrested on 19th August, 1941.²⁴ The Chief Commissioner further requested the Government of India to transfer Jwala Prashad immediately to some other jail as 'his presence was forming a focus for local agitation'.²⁵ But since the other provincial governments were reluctant to have Jwala Prashad Sharma in their Central Jail, he could not be transferred elsewhere.²⁶

On the early morning of 12th November, 1941, sometime after mid-night, Jwala Prashad Sharma made an attempt to escape from the Jail.²⁷ He came out from the barrack through the vacant space of 6¼ inches between the iron grill of the window and its masonry wall.²⁸ But, while coming out, the Head Warder who was on duty, heard noise like that of a tin. He found Jwala Prashad standing on the roof of the verandah. He

23. Letter No. B. 26/1941, (Confdl.), dated 3rd September, 1941, from S. Khurshid, Commissioner, Ajmer, to the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer.

24. Confidential letter No. 197 (c), A.O.F. 39/41, dated 17th September, 1941, from the A.G.G. in Rajputana to the Secty., Government of India, File No. 94/17/41, Pol.(I) of 1911, Home, Pol., NAI.

25. Confidential letter No. 197 (c), A.O.F. 39/41, dated 17th September, 1941, from the A.G.G. in Rajputana to the Secty., Government of India, *op. cit.*, NAI.

26. Letter No. 94/17/41, Pol.(I), dated, 31st October, 1941, from the Secretary, Govt. of India to the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer. File No. 94/17/41, Pol.(I), of 1941, Home, Pol., NAI.

27. Confidential letter No. 2601 dated 12th November, 1941, from Superintendent, Central Jail, Ajmer, to the Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara. File No. 94/17/41, Pol.(I) of 1941, Home, Pol., NAI.

28. *Ibid.*

had also a knife in his hand which the Head Warder took from him. Jwala Prashad, however, offered to get inside his ward if the Head Warder could hush up the matter and get away for a while. The Head Warder, having done so, the prisoner got inside the ward.²⁹ Jwala Prashad was, then, tried by the Additional Assistant Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, under the Rule 26(6) read with rule 121 of the Defence of India rules and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 months and to pay a fine of rupees fifty or in default to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for three months.³⁰ Jwala Prashad preferred an appeal in the Sessions Court, Ajmer. His appeal was upheld on 16th February, 1942, and his conviction was quashed.³¹ However, a fresh complaint was filed against him on 25th February, 1942, and he was sentenced to six months' rigorous imprisonment.³²

On 29th February, 1944, Jwala Prashad Sharma along with another prisoner Raghuraj Singh made a successful attempt to escape from the Central Jail, Ajmer.³³ Both the prisoners were confined in barrack No. 11 of the Congress Security Prisoners' Ward. They, however, escaped by means of a ladder constructed from two iron poles (used for supporting the security prisoners volleyball net) and various pieces of wood (largely taken from articles of furniture), the whole being tied together with dhotis and strips torn from dhotis, in all about ten dhotis seem

29. *Ibid.*

30. Letter No. A/20-7 (Confdl.), dated 16th January, 1942, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, to the Secretary, Government of India, File No. 94/17/41, Pol(I), of 1911, Home, Pol., NAI.

31. D.O. letter No. A/20-7 (Confdl.), dated 16th March, 1942, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, to the Secretary, Government of India. File No. 94/17/41, Pol.(I) of 1941, Home, Pol., NAI.

32. D.O. letter No. A/20-7 (Confdl.), dated 14/15, June, 1942, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, to the Secretary, Government of India. File No. 94/17/41, Pol.(I) of 1941, Home, Pol., NAI. The Appeal was preferred by Jwala Prashad but was dismissed by the Sessions Judge, Ajmer-Merwara.

33. Telegram No. W/S-II, III dated 1st March, 1944, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer, to the Secretary, Govt. of India. File No. 3/9/44, Pol.(I) of 1944, Home, Pol., NAI.

to have been used for the purpose.³⁴ However, all attempts to recapture them failed.³⁵

Civil Disobedience Movement

On the other hand as a result of 'Quit India' movement the civil disobedience movement was continuing in Ajmer-Merwara. By April, 1943, 64 persons which included Bal Krishna Kaul, Hari Bhau Upadhyaya, Ram Narayan Chowdhry, Gokul Lal Asava, Rishi Dutta Mehta, Mukat Behari Lal Bhargava, Ladu Ram Joshi, Swami Kumaranand, Shrimati Gomti Devi Bhargava, Amba Lal Mathur and Shobha Lal Gupta were arrested.³⁶ Later 17 out of them were released. Bal Krishna Kaul and Gokul Lal Asava were sentenced to four months' rigorous imprisonment for disobeying the orders of the Jail authorities.³⁷ In protest Bal Krishna Kaul went on hunger strike.³⁸ Mrs. Kaul's request to meet her husband in jail was refused by the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer. However, on the intervention of Mahatma Gandhi,³⁹ Bal Krishna Kaul gave up his fast and Mrs. Kaul and his family members were allowed to meet him.⁴⁰

34. Report dated 1st March, 1911. (Confidential), of the Deputy Commissioner, Ajmer, File No. 3/9/44, Pol. (I) of 1944, Home. Pol., NAI.

35. Memo. No. M/222 dated 13th April, 1944 (Secret) from Superintendent of Police, Ajmer, to the Deputy Commissioner, Ajmer, File No. 3/9/44, Pol. (I) of 1944, Home. Pol., NAI.

36. Report of Superintendent of Police Ajmer—enclosure to letter No. C/15-25, V, dated 23rd April, 1943, from the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer, to the Home Dept., Government of India, File No. 3/78/43, Pol. (I) of 1943, Home. Pol., NAI.

37. Question asked by Sardar Mangal Singh in the Legislative Assembly on 28th March 1944, and reply given, File No. 22/56/44, Pol. (I) of 1944, Home. Pol., NAI.

38. Letter No. A/20-20, dated 5th June, 1944, from Chief Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, to Home Dept., Government of India. File No. 44/76/44, Pol. (I) of 1944, Home. Pol., NAI.

39. Telegram dated 17th May, 1944, from Mahatma Gandhi to Bal Krishna Kaul. File No. 44/76/44, Pol. (I) of 1944, Home. Pol., NAI.

40. Letter No. A/20-20, dated 5th June, 1944, from Chief Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, to Home Dept., Government of India. *op. cit.*, NAI.

In the year 1944, the Civil disobedience movement was suspended under the shadow of the events like Simla Conference and the visit of the Cabinet Mission.

Jaipur

The impact of the happenings in Ajmer spread rapidly in the other States of Rajasthan and a demand of 'responsible government' became the goal of the political movements in the various States. Jaipur was the most progressive State in which a number of constitutional reforms were introduced to pacify the people, though at the earlier stage, like other States, the Jaipur authorities resorted to the policy of repression to stamp out political movements. On 1st January, 1940, a notification was issued according to which the State Government employees were prohibited to discuss the policy matters of the State as this might prove prejudicial to State's security.⁴¹ In January, 1940, Jaipur Praja Mandal issued a leaflet condemning the State Policy of repression and urging the State to establish the 'responsible government'. This provoked Raja Gyan Nath, the State Prime Minister, and he threatened the State Praja Mandal with dire consequences.⁴² In the last week of February, 1940, the Police raided the offices of the Praja Mandal and took away a number of papers.⁴³ On 9th March, 1940, a communique was issued by the Jaipur State Government in which the Praja Mandal was required to get itself registered. This created a new political situation in the State. However, on 2nd April, 1940,⁴⁴ the Jaipur State Government agreed and accepted that the object of the State Praja Mandal was to 'establish the responsible government under the aegis of the Maharaja of Jaipur' and the Praja Mandal had a right to 'educate popular

41. *Jaipur State Government Gazette*, dated 1st January, 1940.

42. Letter dated 8th January, 1940, from Kapur Chand Patni to Jamna Lal Bajaj. *Patra Vyavhar*, No. 125; letter dated 9th February, 1940, from Chiranji Lal Agarwal to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *op. cit.*, No. 118.

43. *Naujeevan*, dated 4th March, 1940.

44. Letter dated 12th March, 1940, from Jamna Lal Bajaj to Ghanshyam Das Birla, *Patra Vyavhar*, No. 123.

opinion, express the aspirations and needs of the people and to represent their grievances to His Highness' government in a constitutional manner.⁴⁵ But in spite of this, the State did not give up its repressive policy and suspected those who attended the meetings of the Praja Mandal.⁴⁶

At this moment, unfortunately, the serious differences with regard to the mode of work arose among the members of the executive of the State Praja Mandal. This led to the formation of a new Party known as 'Praja Mandal Progressive Party' under the leadership of Chiranji Lal Agarwal.⁴⁷ The result was that the energy of the political workers could not be utilised fully. Due to the mutual differences, Jaipur could not lead the other States of Rajasthan during the 'Quit India' movement.

However, in November, 1941, Political Conference was held at Sikar and Hira Lal Shastri, President of Japiur Praja Mandal, demanded that the Maharaja of Jaipur should realise the explosive situation in the State and should accept the Mandal's demand of establishing a responsible government in the State before it was too late.⁴⁸

A new party under the name of 'Azad Morcha' launched the satyagraha against the autocratic rule. The prominent among the Satyagrahis were Master Ram Karan Joshi, B. S. Deshpande, Om Dutt Shastri, Ladu Ram Joshi and Hans D. Roy.⁴⁹ The agitation continued for more than one and a half years and incidents like picketing and sabotage marked the period.

45. Letter dated 17th April, 1940, from Jamna Lal Bajaj to Ghanshyam Das Birla, *Patra Vyavhar*, No. 124.

46. Letter dated 20th August, 1940, from Kapur Chand Patni to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, No. 127.

47. Letter dated 6th August 1941, from Chiranjilal Agarwal to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, No. 120; letter dated 9th September, 1941, from Durga Lal and Radha Vallabh of Praja Mandal Progressive Party to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Vyavhar*, No. 121.

48. Kela, Bhagwan Das: *Deshi Rajya Shasan*, pp. 552-53.

49. Chaturvedi, Jugal Kishore: *1942 ki kranti Men Rajasthan Ka Yogdan*. Quoted from *Navyug Sandesh*, dated 2nd October, 1952.

Constitutional Reforms

On 26th October, 1942, Maharaja Jaipur appointed a special committee to examine the whole question of constitutional reforms in Jaipur.⁵⁰ The Committee was to formulate, having due regard to the past history of the State, the present State of education and public spirit, the growing political consciousness of the people and other to secure steady and harmonious constitutional progress of the State from the point of view of all interests concerned.⁵¹ The Committee submitted its report in 119 paras but with a note of dissent by all the non-official members on the question of granting the ratio of representation in the Legislative Assembly.

In the year 1945, the Jaipur State implemented the Constitutional reforms as suggested by the Committee as a step towards the establishment of responsible government in the State. Accordingly, a bicameral legislature was established. In the Pratinidhi Sabha out of the total membership of 125, five members were to be nominated, 25 were to be elected from among the Thikana Sardars, two seats were reserved each for businessmen and for women and for labourers and 11 for Muslims. Thus general seats were to be 78. In the Legislative Assembly, the total number of seats were to be 51 out of which 14 were to be nominated, 9 were to be elected by the Thikana Sardars, three seats were reserved for businessmen, women and labourers and four seats were reserved for Muslims.⁵² It is clear that the proposed Legislative Assembly was to be a body compos-

50. The members of the Committee were Rajasevasakta S. Hiranmaiya, Chairman, Khan Sahib M. Altaf Ahmed Kherie and the Law Secretary to the Government as official members. Non-official members were. Thakur Devi Singh of Chomu, Raja Sardar Singh of Khetri, Thakur Khushal Singh of Geegjarh, Chiranji Lal Agarwal, Moulvi Hamidullah Khan, Kapur Chandra Patni, Nemi Chand Kasliwal, Seth Ram Nath Poddar, Shah Alimudin Ahmed. Seth Suraj Bux Ghiya. Tikaram Paliwal, Vidya Dhar Kulhari, Seth Baldeo Das Bajoria, Captain Chiman Singh, Laxmi Narayan Yadav and Syed Hasan Muglaba. The Secretary of the Committee was K. Ishwara Dutta. *Report of the Committee on Constitutional Reforms, 1943.*

51. *Report of the Committee on Constitutional Reforms, 1943.*

52. *Constitutional Reforms Committee Report, 1943.*

ed of the 'Yes men' of the Maharaja. But in spite of the inadequate arrangements the Praja Mandal decided to participate in the elections and could capture 3 seats in Legislative Assembly and 27 seats out of 31 in the Pratinidhi Sabha. The victory of the Praja Mandal was thus an evidence of the public support.

Udaipur (Mewar)

In February, 1941, the Udaipur State government lifted the ban from the Mewar Praja Mandal. This provided an opportunity to the workers of the Mandal to propagate the idea of establishing a 'responsible government' in the State. In November, 1941, under the Presidentship of Manikya Lal Varma, the first session of the Praja Mandal was held in Udaipur, in which the civil and political rights were demanded along with the demand to establish 'responsible government'.⁵³ Simultaneously, to propagate the ideas of 'swadeshi', a Khadi exhibition was also arranged which was inaugurated by Shrimati Vijailaxmi Pandit.⁵⁴ The State Government realised the public feelings and announced that a Legislative Assembly consisting of a majority of elected members would be constituted soon. Besides, the 'Batwali' tax was also withdrawn.⁵⁵

The Satyagraha Movement

When on 8th August, 1942, the All-India Congress Committee launched the 'Quit India' Movement, simultaneously in the States of Rajasthan, the Satyagraha movement for the establishment of responsible government was started. In Udaipur, on 10th August, 1942, Ramesh Chandra Vyas, a labour leader, was arrested and sent to Jail.⁵⁶ On 20th August, 1942, the

53. The session was inaugurated by Acharya Kripalani. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, pp. 241-42; Letter dated 22nd February, 1941, from Manikya Lal Varma to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *Patra Pyavhar*, No. 105.

54. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 241-42.

55. Letter dated 22nd February, 1941, from Manikya Lal Varma to Jamna Lal Bajaj, *op. cit.*, No. 105.

56. *The Riyasat*, dated 26th February, 1941.

Mewar Praja Mandal passed a resolution demanding the establishment of responsible government in the State, and to sever all relations with the British Government.⁵⁷ The State, in reply, resorted to repressive methods. On 21st August, 1942, Manikya Lal Verma, Mohan Lal Sukhadia, Balwant Singh Mehta, and 15 other Satyagrahis were arrested.⁵⁸ A ban was imposed on delivering public speeches, demonstrations, etc., and the Praja Mandal was declared an 'unlawful association'. Soon the number of arrests reached 500 and the movement continued till January, 1944. Subsequently the Satyagrahis arrested during the agitation were set at liberty which included Manikya Lal Varma, Mohan Lal Sukhadia, Balwant Singh Mehta and Moti Lal Tejawat.⁵⁹

On 3rd April, 1944, Rajputana and Central India's Workers' Conference met at Udaipur under the Presidentship of A. V. Sarvate of Indore. In the Conference, Manikya Lal Varma expressed the hope that the Udaipur State will soon withdraw the ban imposed on the Mewar Praja Mandal.⁶⁰ Simultaneously, on 11th October, 1944, the executive committee of the Mewar Praja Mandal met under the Chairmanship of Manikya Lal Varma and demanded the establishment of a Legislative Assembly and Municipal Councils in the State.⁶¹ Fortunately, on 6th September, 1945, the ban from the Mewar Praja Mandal⁶² was lifted. In December, 1945, when the All-India State People's Conference was held in Udaipur the people showed great enthusiasm. A number of large public meetings were organised and the demand for responsible government in the State was again made. How-

57. Chaturvedi, Jugal Kishore: *op. cit.* Quoted from *Navyug Sandesh*, dated 2nd October, 1952; Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp., 242-43.

58. Chaturvedi, Jugal Kishore: *op. cit.*, *Navyug Sandesh*, dated 2nd October, 1953.

59. *The Bombay Chronicle*, dated 14th February, 1944.

60. *The Hindustan Times*, dated 9th April, 1944; Baya, Bhura Lal: *Mewar Ka Privatit Shasan*, quoted from *Navjeevan*, dated 28th August, 1944.

61. *Navjeevan*, dated 16th October, 1944.

62. *Navjeevan*, dated 10th September, 1945.

ever, the State Government in order to suppress the popular demand imposed a ban on public meetings and speeches.⁶³

Officials' Strike

The repressive policy of the State created discontentment not only among the common people but even among the officials of the State. The prices were also going high and this added fuel to the fire.⁶⁴ In January, 1946, the State officials observed a strike in protest against the policy of Sir Vijai Raghavcharya, the Prime Minister. The Police made a lathi-charge and a number of persons were arrested. Later, however, the strike was called off when the State assured that the people's grievances would be redressed.⁶⁵

Constitutional Reforms

Under these circumstances in March, 1947, Sir Raghavcharya, the State Prime Minister, announced the introduction of certain constitutional reforms in the State.⁶⁶ But these reforms proved a 'smoke-screen' as no responsible government was established and the Maharana continued to be the autocratic ruler of the State. The Mewar Praja Mandal, therefore, refused to accept these reforms.⁶⁷ Under the new reforms, a legislature was to be constituted but the executive was not to be responsible to it. In fact, by announcing the establishment of a legislative body which was no more than a 'Darbar' an attempt was made to divert people's attention from their demand for responsible government.⁶⁸ However, the Mewar Praja Mandal participated in the elections to the legislature and cap-

63. Kela, Bhagwan Das: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 243.

64. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 244.

65. *Ibid.*

66. *Naujcran*, dated 12th August, 1946; Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 246.

67. *Naujcran*, dated 23rd June, 1947; Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 246. In the meantime, Sir Raghavcharya left the State and K. M. Munshi became the Constitutional Adviser. He also announced some reforms but Mandal refused to accept them as no steps were taken to establish the responsible government in the State.

68. Resolution passed by Mewar Praja Mandal, Bulletin No. 6, June, 1947.

tured a number of seats which was doubtless a measure of the public support to the Mandal⁶⁹ received.

Bikaner

Like other States of Rajasthan, Bikaner was also in the grip of an agitation for the establishment of responsible government. In order to suppress the agitation, the State government promulgated an amendment in the Bikaner Security Act, banning any person to wear a uniform or a badge which may represent any party or an association, and nobody was allowed to participate in drill procession or physical exercise without prior permission of His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner.⁷⁰

His Highness' declaration of reforms

In November, 1941, Maharaja Ganga Singh,⁷¹ on the eve of his departure to the war front in the Middle East during the Second World War, declared some reforms to be introduced in the administration such as the rule of law, individual liberty, an independent and impartial judiciary, economic assistance to the people, distribution of His Highness' personal and government fund, and utilisation of the mineral wealth of the State and above all the establishment of an efficient administration for the welfare of all.

Movement for responsible government

But contrary to the aforesaid declaration in April, 1942, the Maharaja of Bikaner issued an order banning all the public meetings and right to speech, etc., in order to crush the movement for 'responsible government' in the State.⁷² On 29th July, 1942, the Bikaner Praja Parishad under the Presidentship of Raghuber Dayal Goyal decided to start a movement for 'responsible government' in the State. The State government, however, immediately resorted to repressive policy and arrested

69. *Mewar Praja Mandal Bulletin* No. 7, July, 1947.

70. *Bikaner State Gazette*, dated 15th January, 1940.

71. *The Vishwamitra*, dated 19th November, 1941.

72. *Vir Arjun*, dated 17th April, 1942.

Raghuber Dayal Goyal and externed him on the same day from the Bikaner State⁷³ as his presence was 'prejudicial to the security of the State.'⁷⁴ Reghuber Dayal Goyal, however, urged the State Government to withdraw the order of externment⁷⁵ but the State refused to accede to his request and threatened him with dire consequences in case he attempted to enter the State territory, defying the State orders.⁷⁶

On 26th August, 1944, Raghuber Dayal Goyal defied the State order and entered into the Bikaner territory. He along with his two colleagues—Gangadas Kaushik and Dau Dayal Acharya—were immediately arrested and externed from the State.⁷⁷ The State repressive policy was bitterly criticised all over Rajasthan and 26th October, 1944, was celebrated as a 'day' against the policy of State's repression.⁷⁸ The Bikaner Praja Parishad, however, under the leadership of Pandit Madha Ram Vaidya continued its agitation for the establishment of 'responsible government' in the State.

Meanwhile an interesting incident took place on 27th December, 1945, when one Dwarka Prasad Kaushik, a sixth class student of Rampuria Inter College, Bikaner, responded 'Jai Hind' in Lieu of 'Present, Sir' when roll call was taken in the class. He was turned out from the College without being given any written orders. This caused a great sensation in the city.⁷⁹

73. *Lokmanya*, dated 31st July, 1942. The Bikaner Praja Parishad was established by Raghuber Dayal Goyal on 22nd July, 1942. *Pragati*, dated 27th September, 1942.

74. *Pragati*, dated 27th September, 1942.

75. Letter dated 7th September, 1942, from Raghuber Dayal Goyal to the Prime Minister, Bikaner, *Pragati*, dated 27th September, 1942.

76. *Pragati*, dated 27th September, 1942.

77. Raghuber Dayal Goyal again tried to enter into the Bikaner State Territory on 25th June, 1945, but was arrested along with his other colleagues. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, pp. 206-07, 210; *Navjeevan*, dated 2nd July, 1945.

78. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 206-207, 210.

79. *Vishwamitra*, dated 1st January, 1946. A similar case happened in High School, Nohar (Bikaner). A student had written 'Jai Hind' in his exercise book. This provoked the Headmaster and he gave a good beating to the student. *Hindustan*, dated 2nd January, 1946.

In the wake of repression, the political prisoners served a notice to the State Government stating that if their demand for being provided with the newspapers and with facilities for interviews with their friends and relatives was not granted, they will go on hunger strike.⁸⁰ The State people, on the other hand, observed 23rd and 26th January as 'Netaji Day' and 'Independence Day' respectively and demanded the establishment of 'responsible government' in the State.⁸¹ Observing on the repressive policy of the State, Jawahar Lal Nehru said in his course of speech at the All-India State Peoples' Conference held at Udaipur on 30th January, 1946, "Bikaner has recently achieved an unenviable notoriety.....Conditions in the State prisons are particularly bad and the lot of political prisoners deplorable."⁸²

Bikaner Press Act

But the State government continued its repressive policy. In March, 1946, Maharaja Shardool Singh promulgated 'Bikaner Press Act'⁸³ according to which newspapers were required to furnish security before commencing publication. It was further ordered that non-Bikaneri would not be allowed to become an editor of a newspaper and if a Bikaneri happened to be an editor of a newspaper outside the State, he was to remain under the strict control of the State, whenever he entered the State.

Strike against the Income-tax Bill

In the meantime, the State introduced the Income-tax Bill according to which a person was to be treated 'a citizen of Bikaner, provided he had stayed in the State for 120 days' and was liable to pay the income-tax. The bill was, therefore, vehemently opposed. On 22nd March, 1946, a complete 'hartal' was proposed to be observed, but in the meantime the select

80. *Praja Sewak*, dated 30th January, 1946.

81. *Ibid.*

82. *Praja Sewak*, dated 30th January, 1946.

83. The Press Act was bitterly criticised by all the National Dailies. *Navjeevan*, dated 8th April, 1946; Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 206-207.

committee of the State legislature postponed to consider the bill for the time being and hence the strike was called off.⁶⁴

Peasants' Agitation

In May, 1946, the cultivators of the State marched into the streets holding the National Flag and demonstrated against the repressive policy of the State.⁶⁵ The demonstrators were severely beaten up by the Police and were subject to wild tortures. A number of peasants were arrested including Chowdhry Kumbha Ram Arya.⁶⁶ On 10th May, 1946, Police surrounded the Rajgarh village and committed every sort of cruelty on the peaceful demonstrators. The cultivators were shouting 'Down with the Jagirdars' Zoolums'. As a result of Police atrocities, a number of peasants were severely wounded.⁶⁷ The repressive policy of the State was severely condemned in Calcutta, Bombay and Jaipur. In Calcutta, a meeting of the Bikaner's people held under the presidentship of Nenuram Sharma, condemned police atrocities⁶⁸ and ruthless suppression of Kisan movement in Bikaner. In fact, the Rajgarh village incident created a terror in the State, and the Police adopted third⁶⁹ degree methods to extinguish public awakening.

Raisingh Nagar Tragedy

On 30th June, and 1st July, 1946, the State Peoples' Con-

84. However, a telegraphic information was sent to all the places on 19th and 20th March, 1946, as not to observe the strike, but the information could not reach Nohar and Badra Tehsils of the State in time and a complete strike was observed there. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 207.

85. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 207-208.

86. *Vir Arjun*, dated 5th May, 1946.

87. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 207-208; *Vir Arjun*, dated 15th May, 1946. In protest against the repressive policy of the State, Swami Kumaranand, the Kisan leader, went on hunger-strike. Later, on the State assurance, he withdrew it. *Vishwa Mitra*, dated 16th May, 1946.

88. *Lokmanya*, dated 15th June, 1946.

89. *Navjyoti*, dated 24th June, 1946. The government had become so frustrated that even the slogans like 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai' were also banned. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 208.

ference held a meeting at Raisingh Nagar. The proceedings went on peacefully.⁹⁰ On 1st July, 1946, a man who had a tri-colour flag in his hand went to the railway station to board the train but the police arrested him. This created a stir and a large part of the audience left the conference and ran towards the Station. The police, without any warning, charged the mob with lathis and beat up the people with such severing that they fell unconscious.⁹¹ Simultaneously, the army opened fire. Birbal Singh, one Harijan youth, became the victim of firing with the national flag in his hand and four others received serious injuries.⁹² On 17th July, 1946, 'Birbal Day' was observed all over the State.⁹³ In Sardarshehar, a procession was taken out in the evening. The public enthusiasm was at its peak, the roofs of the houses along the road were packed with women and children who evinced great enthusiasm in the procession. The whole place resounded with national songs and slogans like, 'Down with the Ministers', 'Pannikar⁹⁴ should be removed,' etc., and demanded the release of the political prisoners⁹⁵ and an impartial enquiry into the Raisingh Nagar tragedy.⁹⁶

However, to cool down the tense atmosphere in the State. on 31st August, 1946, Maharaja Shardool Singh declared that a 'responsible government' in the State will soon be established.

Bharatpur

The unrest began in Bharatpur in 1940 when Sir Richard Tatanhold declared the hoisting of national tricolour flag as

90. *Hindustan*, 10th July, 1946.

91. *Ibid.*

92. *Ibid.*

93. *Vishwa Mitra*, dated 17th July, 1946.

94. K. M. Pannikar was the Diwan of the State.

95. *Vishwa Mitra*, dated 17th July, 1946.

96. Kela: *op. cit.*, pp. 208-209. The State refused to conduct the enquiry. However, All-India State Peoples' Conference deputed Gokul Bhai Bhutt and Hira Lal Shastri for an on the spot enquiry.

'illegal'.⁹⁷ Praja Parishad, Bharatpur, was demanding a 'responsible government' in the State for a long time but no heed was paid to its demand. Ultimately with the beginning of 'Quit India' movement on 8th August, 1942, in British India, Bharatpur Praja Parishad also started its agitation for the 'responsible government' on 10th August, 1942.⁹⁸ The prominent leaders of the movement were Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi, Master Adityatendera, Desh Raj, Pandit Revti Sharan, Jagpat Singh, Thakur Jeewa Ram, Ramesh Swami, Raj Bahadur and Master Gopi Lal Yadav.⁹⁹ Public demonstrations, picketing, and sabotage were the main occurrences of the period. People shouted slogans like 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai' and 'Jawahar Lal Nehru Ki Jai'. Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi played an important part in this agitation and was the leader of the Satyagrahis. He sent a number of ladies to court arrest in Bharatpur and accordingly four ladies, accompanied by their children, made a public demonstration in support of the Praja Mandal's demand of 'responsible government'.¹⁰⁰ In order to pacify the agitators the Maharaja made an announcement to the effect that 'Brij Jaya Pratinidhi Sabha would be established in 1943,' but the Praja Mandal refused to co-operate as this was not the true representative council of the people. The State then resorted to a repressive policy and all the leaders of the movement were arrested except Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi, who was guiding the movement from outside, staying at Mathura.¹⁰¹ However, later Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi was also arrested and on 1st August,

97. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 220. An interesting incident took place on 14th February, 1940. A foot-ball match was going on and some of the spectators were wearing the Gandhi Cap. The Police officials immediately got the removal of the caps from the heads of the wearers. This created a lot of resentment among the States' people. *The Sainik*, dated 16th February, 1940.

98. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 221-22.

99. Report sent by Resident, Bharatpur, to the Government of India.

100. *Ibid.*

101. *Ibid.*

1945, was sentenced to one year's imprisonment and fined Rs. 250.¹⁰²

On 24th September, 1945, Raj Bahadur delivered a public speech demanding the establishment of 'responsible government' in the State and urged the Maharaja to accept the public demand.¹⁰³ However, in 1946, on the eve of 'Basant Darbar', Maharaja announced the appointment of a popular Minister who would be elected directly on the basis of adult franchise for a period of three years. But the Praja Parishad, the Muslim League and the Kisan Sabha of the State refused to co-operate till the 'responsible government' was not established in the State.¹⁰⁴ To press their demands, Praja Parishad, under the leadership of Raj Bahadur Vakil and Revti Sharan staged a black flag demonstration on 4th January, 1947, shouting National slogans.¹⁰⁵

In August, 1947, the Barathpur State acceded to the Dominion of India¹⁰⁶ and on 13th September, 1947, under the orders of the Maharaja, warrants against Revti Sharan and Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi and other political workers were withdrawn.¹⁰⁷

Alwar

Though in 1940, the Alwar government agreed to recognise the Praja Mandal¹⁰⁸ differences arose between the State and the

102. However, His Highness the Maharaja of Bharatpur released all the political prisoners in September, 1945. *Report of Resident, Bharatpur*.

103. *Report of Resident, Bharatpur*.

104. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 222-23.

105. Secret Report No. 557/2478-P, dated 13th March, 1947, from S.P., Bikaner, to Dy. I.G.P., Bikaner.

106. Bharatpur State notification, dated 17th August, 1947, Published in *Bharatpur Rajpatra (Extraordinary)*, dated 18th August, 1947, Vol. 38.

107. Order dated 13th September, 1947, of the Maharaja of Bharatpur, *Bharatpur Rajpatra*, dated 15th September, 1947, Vol. 38, Part I.

108. Letter dated 2nd August, 1940, from Master Bhola Nath to Jamna Lal Bajaj. *Patia Vyavhan (Sasta Sahitya Mandal, New Delhi)*, No 86

a number of persons which included Shobha Ram, Ramji Lal, Kunj Behari Lal and Har Narayan.¹¹⁵ When these actions failed to subdue the agitators, in October, 1947, on the eve of Dashera, Maharaja Alwar announced to associate three elected members in the State administrative council.¹¹⁶ But the State's people could not be satisfied with such a nominal reform. A public meeting was organised and during the speeches the State was urged to establish a 'responsible government' immediately.¹¹⁷

Kota

In Kota, as in other States, the demand for establishing a 'responsible government' grew apace. On 26th January, 1941, 'responsible government day' was observed. In the public meetings, the State administration was requested to accede to the public demand of a 'responsible government'.¹¹⁸

In order to control the situation, in November, 1941, the Maharao of Kota declared some constitutional reforms in the State. A new Constitution was framed according to which a legislative council was to be established in the State.¹¹⁹ The Praja Mandal refused to co-operate with the proposed reforms as they were taken as a device to 'misguide the people'.¹²⁰

Agitation for 'responsible government'

In August, 1942, when 'Quit India' movement had started in British India, the Kota Praja Mandal launched a Satyagraha movement for establishing a 'responsible government' in the State. A complete 'Hartal' was observed, and demonstrations were made by the Praja Mandal workers throughout the State. The State resorted to repressive methods and hundreds of persons were arrested. This provoked the people. They closed

115. *Ibid.*

116. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 218.

117. *Ibid.*

118. *Navjeevan*, dated 15th February, 1941.

119. *Kota State Gazette (Extraordinary)*, dated 21st November, 1941.

120. Statement of Moti Lal Jain, General Secretary, Kota State Praja Mandal. Kela, B. D.: *op. cit.*, pp. 372-73.

down the gates of the city, hoisted the national flag over the Kotwali and the Police were compelled to stay in the barracks.¹²¹ Virtually the administration had been completely paralysed for three days, and the city was under people's control.¹²² The Dewan of the State at this stage suggested to the Maharao to use military force and to enter into the city breaking through the gates. But the Maharao declined to do so. Ultimately, on the third day, when Maharao assured the people that their grievances would be looked into and the police would not resort to repressive methods, the gates were reopened.¹²³ The police and the army saluted the national flag and then only the people handed over the administration to the Kota authorities.¹²⁴

However, the administration did not adhere to its words and resorted to repressive methods. A number of persons which included Shyam Narayan Saxena, a public worker, were arrested. As a protest against the Police atrocities, Shyam Narayan Saxena went on hunger strike.¹²⁵ Later, when the Maharao assured that necessary steps would be taken to establish the 'responsible government' in the State, the agitation was suspended.

Sirohi and Dungarpur

In January, 1940, the agitation for establishing a 'responsible government' in Sirohi was started by the Praja Mandal. The State immediately adopted repressive methods and a number of persons were arrested which included Jiwan Mal and Roop Raj who were sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment with a fine of Rs. 200 and a month's rigorous imprisonment with a fine of Rs. 200 respectively.¹²⁶ But, this could not

121. Govind Sahai: *San Bayalis Ka Vidroh*—quoted from Kela. B. D.: *op. cit.*, p. 269.

122. *Ibid.*

123. *Ibid.*, pp. 269-70.

124. *Ibid.*, pp. 269-270. Later on the Diwan of the State was dismissed by the Kota Maharao.

125. *Navjeevan*, dated 13th November, 1944.

126. *The Hindu*, dated 5th January, 1940; *Navjeevan*, dated 6th Jan., 1940.

ease the situation and, therefore, in June, 1940, the Maharao Sirohi granted a general amnesty to the political prisoners and all the Satyagrahis were released.¹²⁷

Similarly, in Dungarpur, the Maharao tried to suppress the popular demand for 'responsible government' in the State, adopted such repressive methods that even the wearing of Gandhi cap was banned in the State.¹²⁸ Bhogi Lal Pandya, President, Dungarpur State Praja Mandal, Gouri Shankar Upadhyaya, Vice-President, Praja Mandal and Shiv Lal Kotriya, Secretary, Praja Mandal, were arrested on 30th April, 1946, in order to paralyse the Mandal's activities.¹²⁹ However, Bhogi Lal Pandya was released after a few days. The police atrocities committed on 31st May, 1947, in Punawara village reached the climax when the people were severely beaten and even ladies were not spared.¹³⁰ Bhogi Lal Pandya, who went to Punawara on behalf of State Praja Mandal on a fact-finding mission, was also severely beaten by the military Police of the State and was arrested.¹³¹ During the confinement, Bhogi Lal Pandya was subjected to severe cruelties. He was not even allowed to answer natural calls¹³² and was kept in Jail without any trial.

However, on 30th June, 1947, Maharao released Bhogi Lal Pandya and other Political prisoners in order to create conditions conducive to peace and order in the State.

Jaisalmer

Jaisalmer has been one of the most backward States of Rajasthan. When the agitation for the establishment of responsible government in the various States of Rajasthan had reached its climax in the thirties, Jaisalmer had been quiet for long.

127. *Navjeevan*, dated 3rd June, 1940.

128. *Vir Arjun*, dated 28th October, 1941.

129. *Navjeevan*, dated 7th May, 1946.

130. *Navjeevan*, dated 16th June, 1947.

131. *Ibid.* The State government, however, alleged that Bhogi Lal Pandya was involved in looting the Customs Chowki of Punawara.

132. *Navjeevan*, dated 16th June, 1947.

The autocratic rule of the Maharawal kept the people suppressed and as such they could not express their grievances or discontentment against the despotic rule of the Maharawal.¹²³

Sagar Mal Gopa and Narayan Das Bhatia were the first among those who tried to awaken the people about their political rights and agitated against the autocratic rule of the Maharawal.¹²⁴ In the beginning, Sagar Mal Gopa and Narain Das Bhati directed the popular agitation while staying at Nagpur and Calcutta respectively, but later Narayan Das Bhati entered the Jaisalmer State and tried to organise public opposition. He was immediately arrested and exiled from the State territory.¹²⁵

Jawahar Day

On 16th November, 1930, when 'Jawahar Day' for the speedy recovery of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru was being celebrated all over the country, the people of Jaisalmer, too, decided to observe the Day.¹²⁶ The autocratic rule could not tolerate such activity and arrested Sagar Mal Gopa, Idan Purohit and Raghunath Singh Mehta.¹²⁷ But, since all the three persons were associated with high officials of the State they could not be kept confined in Jail for more than 36 hours.¹²⁸ Sagar Mal Gopa after his release left Jaisalmer and began to write articles about the Jaisalmer atrocities from Nagpur.

Arrest of Raghunath Singh Mehta

In the year 1932, Raghunath Singh Mehta established a

123. Observing the prevailing conditions in Jaisalmer, Nehru had remarked, 'This is one of the wonders of the world'. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan*, published by District Congress Committee, Jaisalmer. File No. 1/JSL, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

124. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan*, *op. cit.*, R.S.A., Bikaner.

125. *Ibid.*

126. *Ibid.*

127. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan*, *op. cit.*, R.S.A., Bikaner.

128. Sagar Mal Gopa was a son of the State Hakim. Idan was younger brother of the Sarpanch of powerful Pushkarna Society of Jaisalmer and Raghunath Singh Mehta was the grand-son of the Ex-Diwan of the State.

'Maheshwari Yuwak Mandal' with an object to improve the social condition of the people in Jaisalmer. But the despotic Maharawal was not in a mood to allow the establishment of any social institution in the State. Raghunath Singh Mehta was arrested and sentenced to two and half years imprisonment.¹³⁹ This created a stir in the State. However, the State released Raghunath Singh Mehta, after an imprisonment of one month. He left the State and settled at Madras.¹⁴⁰

Establishment of Praja Parishad in Jaisalmer

At this time, Sagar Mal Gopa was serving the cause of Jaisalmeris from Nagpur, Keshav Das Vyas and Ram Chandra Kewalia from Sindh and Shiv Shankar Gopa from Jaisalmer itself. With all courage and enthusiasm Shiv Shankar Gopa established in 1939 a Praja Parishad at Jaisalmer.¹⁴¹ But as a result of the State's repressive policy, he had also to leave the State and join his brother Sagar Mal Gopa at Nagpur.¹⁴²

Arrest of Sagar Mal Gopa

In March, 1941, Sagar Mal Gopa's father expired in Jaisalmer. Sagar Mal Gopa, whose entry was banned in the State, requested the Resident to allow him to visit Jaisalmer on the said occasion. The Resident informed him that the State has no case against him and as such he should not anticipate any 'ill-treatment from Darbar'.¹⁴³ Accordingly, on 22nd May, 1941, Sagar Mal Gopa reached Jaisalmer and when he was going out

139. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan, op. cit.*, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

140. *Ibid.*

141. *Ibid.* The other active workers of the Praja Mandal were Madan Lal Purohit, Lal Chand Joshi, Jiwan Lal Kothari, Geet Mal Jangali, Girdhari Lal Jangali and Mohan Lal Jangali. Lal Chand Joshi and Jeewan Lal Kothari were sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment on account of their political activities in 1939 and 1940, respectively.

142. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan, op. cit.*, R.S.A., Bikaner.

143. Letter No. 1619/418/40, dated 22nd March, 1941, from the Resident, Western Rajputana States to Sagar Mal Gopa. File No. 2/J.S.L., R.S.A., Bikaner.

for a natural call, Police Sub-Inspector Guman Singh along with ten constables arrested him.¹⁴⁴ Sagar Mal Gopa was severely beaten and confined to solitary Jail and later sentenced to six years' rigorous imprisonment on the charge of delivering anti-State speeches and instigating the people against the rule of the Maharawal.¹⁴⁵

During his imprisonment Sagar Mal Gopa was subjected to unprecedented police atrocities. Police Sub-Inspector Guman Singh tortured him to such an extent that even the chillies were thrust into his rectum and nose.¹⁴⁶ Jai Narayan Vyas,¹⁴⁷ Secretary, All-India State Peoples' Conference, and Sheikh Abdullah,¹⁴⁸ Vice-President of the All-India State Peoples' Conference, demanded an immediate intervention.

Death of Sagar Mal Gopa

On 2nd April, 1946, Sagar Mal Gopa sent a letter through the Jailor to the District Judge listing the police atrocities committed on him. But, in the meantime, Police Sub-Inspector Guman Singh got the news of it¹⁴⁹ and intercepted it. He threatened¹⁵⁰ Sagar Mal Gopa to face the consequence thereof. Next day, i.e., 3rd April, 1946, news came out that Sagar Mal Gopa had tried to commit suicide by sprinkling kerosene oil on himself. He was removed to the hospital where he died on 4th

144. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan*, *op. cit.*, Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

145. Judgment dated 10th June, 1942, delivered by B. S. Piel, Sessions Judge, Jaisalmer, File No. 2/J.S.L., R.S.A., Bikaner.

146. Extract from the Diary of Sagar Mal Gopa, File No. 2/J.S.L., R.S.A., Bikaner.

147. Letter No. 72, dated 17th January, 1946, from Jai Narain Vyas to the Political Agent, Western Rajputana States, File No. 2/J.S.L., R.S.A., Bikaner.

148. Letter No. 249 dated 24th January, 1946, from Sheikh Mohammad Abdulla to the Prime Minister, Government of Jaisalmer. File No. 2/J.S.L., R.S.A., Bikaner.

149. Dying Statement of Sagar Mal Gopa, dated 3rd April, 1946. File No. 2/J.S.L., R.S.A., Bikaner.

150. Dying Statement of Sagar Mal Gopa: *op. cit.*, R.S.A., Bikaner.

April, 1946.¹⁵¹ This created a stir in the country. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and Jai Narayan Vyas bitterly criticised the State's repressive policy and demanded an open enquiry into the circumstances of Sagar Mal Gopa's death.¹⁵²

However, on 27th August, 1946, Maharawal of Jaisalmer appointed a single man enquiry commission of Shri G. S. Pathak.¹⁵³ The enquiry commission submitted its report alleging that 'suicide was committed by Sagar Mal Gopa for fear of being beaten or put to torture by the police Sub-Inspector, R. Guman Singh.'¹⁵⁴

Praja Mandal's activities in Jaisalmer

In the meantime on 15th December, 1945, Metha Lal Vyas had established the Jaisalmer Praja Mandal in Jodhpur to avoid immediate arrest.¹⁵⁵ The death of Sagar Mal Gopa encouraged the workers and they were now prepared to face the repressive policy of the Maharawal. On 26th May, 1946, Metha Lal Vyas along with Jai Narain Vyas and with other twenty associates entered the Jaisalmer territory.¹⁵⁶ On 27th May, 1946, Jai Narain Vyas hoisted the National Flag and people welcomed the Flag with the slogans 'Inqalab Zindabad' and 'Praja Mandal Zindabad'.¹⁵⁷

Jodhpur

In the spring of 1940, a political agitation demanding a 'responsible government' was launched under the leadership of

151. Findings of G. S. Pathak, Special Officer in Jaisalmer Enquiry. File No. 2/J.S.C., R.S.A., Bikaner. According to the unofficial report, it is believed that Sagar Mal Gopa was murdered. *Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan*, *op. cit.*, R.S.A., Bikaner.

152. *Press Statement*, dated 27th April, 1946.

153. *Jaisalmer State Government Notification*, dated 27th August, 1946.

154. Findings in Jaisalmer Enquiry. File No. 2/J.S.L., Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.

155. Kela, Bhagwan Das: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, p. 266.

156. Kela, B.D.: *op. cit.*, p. 266.

157. *Ibid.*, p. 267.

Jai Narain Vyas. The people living in the Jagir areas also looked up to the Marwar Lok Parishad for help against the atrocities of Jagirdars.¹⁵⁸ The main grievances of the people in Jagir areas were against hundreds of unreasonable cesses which were being realised from the Kisans of the State. Some of these cases included those which had been declared by the Chief Court and the Maharaja in Council to be illegal and against public policy. The Kansa Lag,¹⁵⁹ allocation of Latai, misuse of the executive and judicial powers of the Jagirdars, collection of the 'chouth' ($\frac{1}{4}$ share), share on sale deeds and mortgage deeds were objected by the people.¹⁶⁰ The Marwar Lok Parishad tried to draw the attention of the State Government towards these evil practices but with no success. In short, 'the Jagirdars went on increasing their atrocities, and the government went on backing them.'¹⁶¹

Agitation for the responsible government

The Marwar Lok Parishad under the leadership of Jai Narayan Vyas and his associates, Achleshwar Prasad, Purshotam Prasad, Kishore Lal Mehta, Abhai Mal Jain, C. R. Chopaniwala and Ganesh Lal Vyas raised their voice. They were interned under the Marwar Ordinance Act, 1932 in the various forts for a year. On 29th March, 1940¹⁶² simultaneously, the Marwar Lok Parishad along with its branches in Jodhpur State were declared illegal.¹⁶³ But, the agitation did not stop and Mathura Das Mathur became the first 'dictator' of the Parishad by the beat of the drum. The State Government promulgated Section 144 prohibiting holding of any public meeting for two months within a radius of five miles of the city.

158. Vaidya, Kanhaiya Lal D.: 'Progressive Jodhpur Under British Prime Minister Sir Donald Field', p. 25. Abu Collection, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

159. Vaidya, Kanhaiya Lal D.: *op. cit.*, p. 25, Abu Collection.

160. *Ibid.*

161. *Ibid.*

162. *The National Call*, dt. 30th March, 1940; *Poor Arjun*, dt. 31st March, 1940; *The Hindu*, dt. 1st April, 1940.

163. *Marwar State Gazetteer (Extra-Ordinary)*, dt. 28th March, 1940.

After these occurrences a large procession, which included Manoharmal Jain, Rana Mal Jain and Devi Singh Bhati, singing National anthem and songs, was taken out via the main market of the city.¹⁶⁴ The Jodhpur Government arrested a number of persons, under the Ordinance of 1932, from amongst a large crowd gathered in the Bazar to witness the procession. Soon afterwards a 'Vaner-Sena' leaders' procession was also taken out through the main bazar, carrying 'Lok Parishad Zindabad', and 'Mahatma Gandhi ki Jai'. This resulted in the arrests of three 'Vaner-Sena' leaders, who were later released.¹⁶⁵ On 1st April, 1940, when a procession of satyagrahis was passing through the main streets shouting the national slogans Moulana Riyazuddin, Bhai Parmanand, Hukum Raj Mehta and Birdi Chand Joshi were arrested.¹⁶⁶ The Satyagraha movement despite the repression gathered momentum. On 3rd April, 1940, Mathura Das Mathur, the first 'dictator' of Marwar Lok Parishad, was arrested under the Ordinance of 1932 and interned for one year in Parbatsar.¹⁶⁷ Mathura Das Mathur was leading a demonstration of about 10,000 people, when the police made a severe lathi charge which resulted in more than 30 persons injured including five seriously.¹⁶⁸ On 10th April, 1940, the police again made a severe lathi-charge on a procession of satyagrahis and arrested Ranchordas Gattani.¹⁶⁹ It is believed that at least 100 persons were seriously injured. In the wake of arrests Tarak Parshad Sharma, the President of the Marwar Students' Federation, was also taken in custody¹⁷⁰ to be subsequently acquitted by the Special Court on 26th April, 1940.¹⁷¹ The repressive policy of the Maharaja was severely cri-

164. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 31st March, 1940; *Veer Arjun*, dt. 31st March, 1940; *The Arjun*, dt. 31st March 1940; *Sainik*, 1st April, 1940.

165. *Ibid.*

166. *Arjun*, dt. 1st April, 1940.

167. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 4th April, 1940.

168. *Ibid.*

169. *Sainik*, dt. 10th April, 1940.

170. *Hindustan*, dt. 16th April, 1940; *Veer Arjun*, dt. 20th April, 1940.

171. *Hindustan*, dt. 30th April, 1940.

ticised and an impartial enquiry into the police atrocities was demanded.¹⁷² But the State Government paid no heed to public grievances and continued its policy of repression. Every day a number of persons were arrested. In June, 1940, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, President, State Peoples' Conference, therefore, deputed Dwarka Nath Kachru to visit Jodhpur and to report on the political situation prevailing there.¹⁷³ The State Government did not co-operate with Kachru. Kachru, however, submitted his report stating that the political atmosphere in the State was so suffocating that even the registration of a 'type-writer' was essential.¹⁷⁴

In June, 1940, an agreement was made between the State Government and the Marwar Lok Parishad, according to which the State Government recognised the Marwar Lok Parishad and the political prisoners were released, who were given a warm public reception.¹⁷⁵

In the rural areas also there was an awakening. The villagers of Raipur demonstrated against the 'Thikana' atrocities and illegal cesses imposed on them.¹⁷⁶ Raipur 'Thikana' and State Government resorted to repressive methods and arrested 500 cultivators, who were later released.¹⁷⁷

In view of the repressive policy of the State, the Marwar Lok Parishad decided to boycott the proposed elections to the Representative Advisory Assembly which was totally inadequate,¹⁷⁸ and threatened to launch a Satyagraha movement against

172. *Navjeevan*, dt. 20th May, 1940.

173. *Karam Bhumi*, dt. 17th June, 1940.

174. *Harijan*, dt. 20th June, 1940; *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 27th June, 1940; *National Call*, dt. 28th June, 1940; *Veer Arjun*, dt. 28th June, 1940.

175. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 5th April, 1941; *Veer Arjun*, dt. 7th April, 1941.

176. *Ibid.*

177. *Ibid.*

178. Resolution adopted by Marwar Lok Parishad at Phalodi. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 28th Sept., 1941.

the artocities of 'Thikana' Jagirdars.¹⁷⁹ The Marwar Lok Parishad appealed to 'the Government to rectify the situation and to take steps to put a stop to the 'Nazism of Jagirdars' which was even worse than 'Hitler's Nazism' and was 'a danger to His Highness and his subjects.'¹⁸⁰ But the Prime Minister, an Englishman, did not pay any attention to the people's demand and in order to crush the forthcoming people's Satyagraha, banned the Marwar Students' Conference which was to be held from 3rd January to 5th January.¹⁸¹

Responsible day and the Chandawal Tragedy

On 9th February, 1942, an open session of the Marwar Lok Parishad was held at Ladnu.¹⁸² Delivering the Presidential address, Ranchordass Gattani demanded the abolition of Lag-begar (cesses) and the establishment of 'responsible Government' before it was too late.¹⁸³ The Marwar Lok Parishad decided to observe 'Responsible Government Day' on 28th March, 1942.¹⁸⁴ The 'thikanadars' of Chandawal (Marwar) did not allow the workers of the Lok Parishad to observe 'Responsible Government Day' in the village. The workers who came from Sojat were stopped on the 'Imperial Road' and about 150 persons of 'thikana' with the help of Jodhpur State Police assaulted them with lathis and spears as a result of which over 25

179. Statement of Jai Narain Vyas, Secretary, All-India State People's Conference, *Praja Sewak*, dt. 12th Nov., 1941; *Hindustan*, dt. 12th Nov., 1941.

180. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 29th Dec., 1941; A letter was sent by Col. Sir D. M. Field, Prime Minister to the widowed mother of Hukam Raj Mehta, the President of Marwar Students' Union, threatening her that in case she failed to stop the political activities of her son, the State Government would stop her pension. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 30th Dec., 1941; Mr. A. P. Cox, Director of Education, Jodhpur, also issued an order banning the Marwar Students' Union. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 8th January, 1942.

181. *Veer Arjun*, dt. Feb., 1942.

182. *Hindustan*, dt. 14th Feb., 1942.

183. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 21st March, 1942.

184. The conditions of Mitha Lal Trivedi, popular leader of Sojat and ex-treasurer of the Marwar Lok Parishad, and Vijai Shankar were reported to be serious. *Veer Arjun*, dt. 1st April, 1942.

persons received injuries and seven of whom were admitted to the Jodhpur Hospital.¹⁸⁵ Persons having sympathy with the 'Lok-Parishad' were also dragged out of their houses and beaten.¹⁸⁶ This created a tense situation and a complete hartal was observed.¹⁸⁷ Ranchordas Gattani, President, Marwar Lok Parishad, personally visited the place to appraise himself of the situation.¹⁸⁸ On enquiry, it was revealed that the 'thikana' jagirdars were responsible for the severe beating the agitators received and after the incident 'the assailants were served with drinks by the Kunwar of Chandawal.'¹⁸⁹ Jai Narain Vyas also visited Sojat for the necessary inquiry into the Chandawal incident but in order to conceal the facts the State Government declared 144 of Cr.P.C. and banned public meetings, etc., for one month with effect from 18th April, 1942.¹⁹⁰

Satyagraha Movement

Under these circumstances, the Marwar Lok Parishad decided to launch another Satyagraha movement and appointed Jai Narain Vyas as the first 'dictator'.¹⁹¹ Before starting the Satyagraha movement Jai Narain Vyas tried to seek an interview with the Maharaja of Jodhpur but was rebuffed.¹⁹² In the meantime Jai Narain Vyas published a booklet entitled 'Marwar Mai Uttardayi Shashan' and issued a pamphlet dealing with the atrocities of jagirdars, entitled '*Jodhpur Ki Isthiti Par Prakash*'. This provoked the Maharaja of Jodhpur and the Minister-in-waiting who charged Jai Narain Vyas with spreading discontentment among the people and warned that he would be responsible for the consequences.¹⁹³ On 26th May, Jai Narain Vyas

185. Even the women were not spared; one, Smt. Sushila Devi of Sojat, received several lathi blows. *Veer Arjun*, dt. 1st April, 1942.

186. *Veer Arjun*, dt. 1st April, 1942.

187. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 4th April, 1942.

188. *Hindustan*, dt. 10th April, 1942.

189. *Hindustan*, dt. 24th May, 1942.

190. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 29th May, 1942.

191. *Ibid.*, dt. 31st May, 1942.

192. *The National Call*, dt. 1st June, 1942.

193. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 7th June, 1942.

and his colleagues resigned 'en bloc' from the membership of the Jodhpur Municipal Board in protest against the State's repressive policy.

The Suppression

To stem the tide of popular agitation the State resorted once again to repressive methods and Jai Narain Vyas was arrested on 27th May, 1942, under Section 124-A, along with Fateh Raj, a Lok Parishad worker.¹⁹¹ Mathura Das Mathur, who succeeded as a 'Second dictator' of the Parishad, was also arrested on 29th May, 1942, under Sections 10-A and 10-B of the Marwar Sedition Act.¹⁹² The chain of arrests continued and a number of persons including Achleshwar Prasad Sharma, Chaggan Raj Chopasaniwala, Ganesh Lal Vyas, and Abhai Mal Jain were arrested.¹⁹³ Observing on the situation, Jawahar Lal Nehru issued a press note and said, "Our demand for complete independence is the only possible demand, for there is no other way to put an end to these monstrous happenings in India."¹⁹⁷ All India State Peoples' Conference deputed Kanhaiya Lal Vaidya, a member of the Standing Committee, to study the situation in the State but the State Government ordered him to leave the State territory immediately, banning his entry into Marwar for one year.¹⁹⁹ The repressive policy of the State was severely criticised by all the leaders like Hari Bhau Upadhyaya of Ajmer, Hira Lal Shastri and Ladu Ram Joshi of Jaipur, Bhola Nath Master of Alwar, Gokul Bhai Bhatt and Pukhraj Singh of Sirohi, Mukut Behari Lal Bhargava of Beawar, and Satyadev Vidyalkar of Delhi, etc.¹⁹⁹

Death of Bal Mukund Bissa

In the meantime, following its repressive policy, the State police arrested Bal Mukund Bissa, a Lok Parishad worker and

194. Order No. 49-P, dt. 4th July, 1942, of the Jodhpur State Government. Vaidya Kanhaiya Lal: *Progressive Jodhpur under British Prime Minister Sir Donald Field*, p. 2.

195. *Hindustan*, dt. 17th June, 1942.

196. Vaidya, Kanhaiya Lal: *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

197. *Ibid.*

198. *Ibid.*

199. Vaidya, Kanhaiya Lal: *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

some other Satyagrahis on 11th June, 1942. They were badly treated in Jail and were not provided with food until 11 a.m. the next day. In protest the detenues wrote a letter to the Prime Minister asking him 'to let them know the charges against them.' They further intimated him 'that they would not take their meals until a reply to the letter was received'.²⁰⁰ The State Government after '100 hours' informed the detenues that 'they were worse than ordinary criminals and would be treated as such'.²⁰¹ Jai Narain Vyas and other colleagues also complained of the misbehaviour of Jail authorities and of food, etc. In protest against the attitude of the authority all detenues went on hunger strike w.e.f. 11th June, 1942.²⁰²

On 12th June, 1942, the detenues, because of the scorching heat of June, requested the jail authorities to allow them to sleep in the open but the request was turned down. The detenues, however, continued to resist passively and non-violently.²⁰³ Thereupon the authorities ordered the criminal prisoners to pounce upon them and put them forcibly into the barracks and to their entire satisfaction the peaceful Satyagrahis were over-powered and kicked into the barracks 'to enjoy a peaceful sleep'.²⁰⁴ In being thrust into the barracks Bal Mukund Bissa, Ranchordas Gattani and others received serious injuries. Bal Mukund Bissa who had given up his hunger strike on 16th June, 1942 at 10 p.m. due to the injuries fell ill. But nobody cared for him, but when on 19th June, his temperature shot up to 105 and above the authorities thought of removing him to the hospital.²⁰⁵ In the meantime his request to see his old father, mother, young wife and children was refused.²⁰⁶ In such high temperature and in the scorching heat of the afternoon, he was taken to the Windhom Hospital in unconscious state where he died soon after

200. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

201. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

202. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

203. *Ibid.*

204. *Ibid.*

205. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 22nd June, 1942.

206. *Harijan*, dt. 6th July, 1942.

reaching there.²⁰⁷ The death of Bal Mukund Bissa created a stir in the city. The police banned the funeral procession and dispersed the mob by lathi charge.²⁰⁸ The Maharaja's attitude was severely criticised.²⁰⁹ Mahatma Gandhi expressed the hope that 'good sense would prevail over the Maharaja and he would immediately take the steps towards establishing a 'responsible government' in the State.²¹⁰

However, the Satyagraha movement continued, and for the first time in the political life of Jodhpur a batch of 11 women wearing kesaria saris took recourse to Satyagraha near Ghanta Ghar in the city.²¹¹ Smt. Mahima Devi Kinker read the proscribed booklet styled 'Responsible Government Campaign in Marwar',²¹² and led a group of women on 17th July, 1942.²¹³ On 26th July, 'Marwar-Satyagraha Day' was observed throughout Rajasthan and mass public meetings were organised.²¹⁴

August 1942 and after

With the political developments in August, 1942, in British India, Jodhpur agitation spread out in Districts of Phalodi, Sojat and Nagaur and a number of persons were arrested. In the meantime on 4th August, 1942, Jai Narain Vyas was sentenced to 6½ years' rigorous imprisonment, Mathura Das Mathur to 2½ years' R.I. and similarly the other Satyagrahis were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.²¹⁵ All over India, the judgment of the Jodhpur court was bitterly criticised and the Maharaja was requested to rectify the situation.²¹⁶

207. *The Arjun*, dt. 8th July, 1942.

208. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 14th July, 1942.

209. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 21st July, 1942.

210. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 21st July, 1942.

211. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 5th August and 16th August, 1942.

212. *Harijan*, dt. 13th August, 1942; *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 16th Aug., 1942.

213. Order dt. 24th May, 1944 from the Government of Jodhpur. *Jodhpur Government Gazette*, dt. 27th May, 1944.

214. *The Hindustan Times*, dt. 31st July, 1945.

215. *Navjivan*, dt. 13th August, 1945.

216. Kela, B. D.: *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti*, pp. 235-236.

Though the political agitation in Marwar continued till 1944, the preventive measures taken by the Government had curbed it considerably. Bhogi Lal Pandya and Gopi Krishna Vijaivargi came to Jodhpur to persuade Jai Narain Vyas and his other colleagues for a compromise between the agitators and the Jodhpur Government. After some negotiation, in May, 1944, the State Government released Jai Narain Vyas and his other colleagues in order 'to create a healthy atmosphere in the State'.²¹⁷ In the year 1945, the State Government announced an establishment of 'Representative Assembly consisting of 69 members, a majority of whom were to be directly elected'.²¹⁸ But in fact this kind of an assembly was to be merely an advisory body as no real power was given to it.²¹⁹

Dabra agitation (1947)

In spite of the negotiations between the Praja Priashad workers and the State the atrocities of the Thikana Jagirdars continued. In October, 1946, therefore, the Marwar Lok Parishad had to start its campaign against the repressive policy of the Jagirdars in the rural areas. About 700 families of Pokaran were compelled to leave the village in view of the thikana's policy of victimization.²²⁰ To protest against such heinous acts it was decided to hold a Conference at Dabra village in district Didwana in 1947. But Jagirdars resorted to suppression and a number of persons of Marwar Lok Parishad including Radha Kishan Jat, Dwarka Das Purohit, Mathura Das Mathur and Chagan Raj Chopasaniwala were arrested and charged with sedition. However, later with the establishment of popular ministry under Jai Narain Vyas in the State the agitation was suspended and the cases were withdrawn.

Merger of the Rajputana States

With the decision of the British Government to transfer

217. *Ibid.*

218. *Ibid.*

219. *Ibid.*

220. *Ibid.*

Power to All-India National Congress, India became independent on 15th August, 1947. The acute problem before the Government of India was the integration of Indian States in the Indian Union. However, with the increasing efforts of Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel and Home Secretary Shri V. P. Menon the Indian States decided to merge in the Indian Union. So far as the integration of the States of Rajputana was concerned, it was done in five stages. The first was the formation of the Matsya Union, which embraced the four States of Alwar, Bharatpur, Dholpur, and Karauli and was inaugurated on 28th February, 1948.²²¹ The second was the formation of the first Rajasthan Union with Banswara, Bundi, Dungarpur, Jhalawar, Kishangarh, Kota, Partabgarh, Shahpura, and Tonk which came into existence on 25th March, 1948.²²² The third was the inclusion of Udaipur in the first Rajasthan Union which gave its consent on 1st April, 1948.²²³ The fourth was the creation of Greater Rajasthan by the inclusion of the remaining Rajput States of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner and Jaisalmer, and the fifth stage was the incorporation of the Matsya Union with greater Rajasthan which came into existence on 30th March, 1949.²²⁴

Thus with the foundation of the Praja Mandals, Praja Parishads and Kisan Sabhas, etc., the progressive nationalists in the States were animated by a new dynamism. They were also awakened to a new purpose in life by the teachings and the sacrifices of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawahar Lal Nehru. National pride was promoted by the sacrifices of the leaders working within and outside Rajasthan. Throughout this period patriotic fervour was fanned by ruthless repression exercised by the State authorities. A determined group of workers like Manikya Lal Varma, Jai Narain Vyas, Mathura Das Mathur, Hari Bhau Upadhyaya, etc., destined to become the spearhead of the struggle for the establishment of responsible government in the States led the people against the Princes ably and with courage

221. Menon, V. P.: *The Integration of Indian States*, p. 255.

222. *Ibid.*, p. 258.

223. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

224. *Ibid.*, p. 268.

Mass-movements were organised and as a result the State governments had to introduce popular government and constitutional reforms. It imparted a combative self-confidence to all the workers in Rajasthan. Their influence rose rapidly by noble sacrifices and tortures in jails. Then the launching of the Quit India Movement of 1942, the visit of the Cripps Mission, the Simla Conference (1945), and the coming to power of the Labour Party in Britain, the Cabinet Mission, 1946, and the decision of the British Government to transfer Power were the epochal events which led the country towards the goal of achieving independence. Rajasthan too was benefited when the various States merged in the State of Rajasthan and acceded to the Dominion of India. The long struggle thus, ended in triumph.

CHAPTER VIII

EPILOGUE

The mediaeval wars in Rajasthan led to the establishment of Muslim and Mughal suzerainty in Rajasthan. The Rajput rulers fought till the last drop of their blood for the sake of their motherland but their mutual rivalry ultimately proved disastrous. In the beginning of the 19th century, anarchy prevailed all over Rajasthan. The Marathas and the Pindaris looted Rajasthan to their utmost satisfaction and the Rajput rulers looked on helplessly. In these circumstances, the British East India Company followed the policy of 'intervention' and invited the Rajput rulers to enter into treaty alliances with the Company and guaranteed security with regard to their territorial boundaries. Accordingly, during the period 1803 to 1818 almost all the States of Rajputana entered into treaty alliances with the British and thus began to consider themselves duly 'protected'.

But the differences among the ruling Chiefs and the Jagirdars of various estates with regard to the observance of customs and conventions on various occasions led to the internal unrest and the suzerainty of the Maharajas was challenged. In the meantime, Mutiny broke out in 1857. In Rajasthan, the Mutiny was confined to the military centres of Nasirabad, Neemuch and Deoli. But the mutineers, while fleeing from one place to another across the territories of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Tonk and Mewar, etc., tried to obtain the co-operation of the rulers, the chiefs, as well as the general people but they failed. The people did not participate and remained indifferent. However, the dis-

gruntled Chief of Awa tried to make capital out of it and rose against the authority of the Maharaja of Jodhpur. The Chiefs of Kotharia and Salumber of Mewar also showed their sympathy for the mutineers. But with the help of the Rajput rulers, the mutineers were cut to size by the British.

After the Mutiny, a process of consolidation of the British paramountcy was started with Queen Victoria's proclamation of November 1, 1858. The British protection had made the rulers helpless, irresponsible and indifferent to their subjects. The British suggested to the rulers to introduce various social and political reforms in their respective States and to pay more attention to redress the grievances of their people. This led to the introduction of reforms on British India pattern. At an early stage, the Maharana of Udaipur and the State subjects objected to these reforms as they were against the age-old traditions, but later, they accepted. Such acceptance resulted in the development of their social, economic, and political life. The latter half of the 19th century witnessed a period of general Indian renaissance. A number of social, cultural and religious movements like Brahmo Samaj, Arya Samaj, etc., took place. The Arya Samaj movement enlightened the people and urged them to adopt 'Swadeshi', 'Swadharma', 'Swabhasha' and 'Swarajya'. Simultaneously, the growth of newspapers and literature remarkably contributed towards expanding the idea of nationalism amongst the Indian people.

In 1885, the birth of the National Congress provided a impetus to political regeneration in the country. The last decade of the 19th century witnessed the rise of militant nationalism in various parts of the country including Rajasthan. The Italian-Abyssinian War (1896-97), the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), the partition of Bengal (1905), and the establishment of secret societies deeply affected the youth of Rajasthan. Shyama Ji Krishna Varma, Arjun Lal Sethi, Kesri Singh Barhat, Rao Gopal Singh of Kharwa and others joined the network of the revolutionary organizations of Northern India with an object to achieve 'Swarajya'. The States of Rajputana, in order to crush the movement, enforced a number of proclamations, Anti-Seditious

Act, Press Act, etc., and intercepted the postal articles which were to carry the nationalist material.

The period also witnessed the agrarian unrest in some of the estates like Bijoliya, Bengu, Bundi and Sirohi. The main causes of discontentment were Begar (forced labour) and the hundreds of 'Lag-Bag' (cesses). Under the dynamic leadership of Vijai Singh Pathik, the cultivators fought with the Thikana authorities and ultimately succeeded in achieving their ends.

In this context, a most interesting feature was that the Bhils, who had remarkably assisted the British during the Mutiny, rose against the British. The introduction of new reforms like census and land settlement were regarded by them as an encroachment on their rights and privileges which they were enjoying for a number of centuries. The freedom loving Bhils revolted in 1881 and 1882, and later, in 1924, under the leadership of Moti Lal Tejawat. However, the State's repressive policy and the arrest of Tejawat ultimately suppressed them, but these risings created in them a sense of political consciousness and an urge to keep their civil and political liberty unimpaired.

In the year 1914, the First World War broke out. This proved a godsend to the Rajput Princes. They were fully aware of the fact that the British authority could alone protect their 'gaddis' and in the event of the disappearance of the British authority they would not be in a position to enjoy privileges, wealth and to exercise absolute authority. Almost all the Princes of Rajasthan, therefore, co-operated with the Imperial Power and helped it in cash and kind and celebrated the victory of the allies as their own.

In British India, the nationalists were hopeful that after the war, they would achieve 'Dominion Status' for the country but their hopes were dashed when as a reward of their co-operation during the War, they received the Rowlett Act of 1918 and the Jalianwala Bagh tragedy of 13th April, 1919. Simultaneously, the Government of India Act, 1919, did not fulfil the aspirations of the people. Mahatma Gandhi, therefore, decided to launch a non-co-operation movement in 1921-22. This affected the people of Rajasthan and they also contributed their share to the

movement. During the period, a number of agitations took place in Bundi, Bijoliya, Bengu, Bharatpur, Sirohi and Alwar. In 1925, Neemuchana tragedy in Bansur and Gazi-Ka-Thana Tehsils of Alwar attracted the attention of the whole Nation. The State Peoples' Conferences and the local institutions like Marwar Hithkarini Sabha, Rajasthan Sewak Sangh, etc., continued to demand civic and political rights for the people of the States.

In 1930, Mahatma Gandhi launched another civil disobedience movement. This created a stir in Rajasthan. In Ajmer, Jodhpur, Jaipur, Bikaner, Udaipur and Bharatpur people openly agitated and demanded the establishment of 'responsible governments'. The State's people picketed before the foreign cloth and liquor shops unhesitatingly and demanded the boycott of foreign goods. This led to the establishment of Praja Mandals in various States of Rajasthan. The States adopted the policy of repression and of victimization. But the people had by then become so courageous that even 'open letters' appeared against the Maharaja of Bikaner and booklets and leaflets were distributed amongst the members and delegates on the eve of the Round Table Conference. The policy of repression led to the birth of Civil Disobedience Movement. The Jat Mahasabha agitation in Bharatpur, the Bijoliya movement in Mewar and the Jaipur-Sikar disturbances marked the period. The States refused to recognise Praja Mandals as lawful institutions and this led to the growth of political movements in the States of Rajputana. At this stage, two groups were working in Rajasthan. One was operating under the leadership of Vijai Singh Pathik, Arjun Lal Sethi and Baba Narsingh Das and the other one was under Jamna Lal Bajaj and his associates, Hari Bhau Upadhyaya and Hira Lal Shastri. But, unfortunately, their mutual differences did not allow them to work together for sometime. This was most unfortunate for Rajasthan and the Princes could make capital out of it. However, they patched up their differences and demand for the establishment of responsible governments in the States was raised almost unanimously by Jai Narain Vyas in Marwar (Jodhpur), Manikya Lal Varma in Mewar (Udaipur), Jamna Lal Bajaj and Hira Lal Shastri in Jaipur,

Bhogi Lal Pandaya in Doongarpur, Master Bhola Nath in Alwar, Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi and Raj Bahadur in Bharatpur and by Swami Gopal Das and Khub Ram Saraf in Bikaner, etc. Simultaneously, once again the period 1931-32, witnessed the terrorist activities in Northern India and in Rajasthan. Ajmer became the centre under the leadership of Pandit Jwala Prashad Sharma. Later with the arrest of Pandit Jwala Prashad Sharma, the activities were suppressed.

In the year 1939, the Second World War appeared imminent and ultimately broke out on 3rd September, 1939. The Rajput Princes again helped the British in cash and kind and placed all their resources at the disposal of the British in order to protect British imperialism.

In 1940, the Marwar Lok Parishad, under the dynamic leadership of Jai Narain Vyas and Mathura Das Mathur, started the agitation for the 'responsible government' in the State. Simultaneously, in Jaipur, Udaipur, Bharatpur, Sirohi, Kota, Doongarpur, etc., the agitation for the 'better government' was started. The arrest of Jamna Lal Bajaj in Jaipur and of Jai Narain Vyas in Jodhpur and Manikya Lal Varma in Udaipur, created a stir in India. However, good sense prevailed over the States' administration and ultimately the States decided to introduce constitutional reforms by way of establishing representative assemblies.

In this respect Jaisalmer's contribution cannot be overlooked. The activities of Sagar Mal Gopa, Raghunath Das Mehta and Shiv Shanker Gopa cannot be ignored. The sacrifice made by Sagar Mal Gopa awakened the people of this backward State which Nehru had once characterised as the 'eighth wonder of the world'.

On August 8, 1942, 'Quit India' movement began. Rajasthan also fell in with the rest of the country. The State governments resorted to outrageous measures to suppress the popular movement but in spite of all the repressive methods, the States' administration failed to suppress it. The State governments, however, tried to deceive the subjects by announcing constitu-

tional reforms but they could not succeed. Ultimately, when on 15th August, 1947, India became independent, the States of Rajasthan decided to merge in the Indian Union and this ended a long struggle of the States. At last sacrifices bore fruit and people's aspirations were fulfilled with the establishment of popular ministries in the States.

APPENDIX I

'Red' Letter Addressed to the Deputy S.P., Ajmer

BEWARE H.S.R.A. RAJASTHAN BRANCH

1. PARTY ALARMED WITH THE INFORMATION OF YOUR NEW POLICY OF 'TERRORISING THE PUBLIC' TO CRUSH IT.
2. PARTY CONSIDERS YOU NOW MORE DANGEROUS THAN PREVIOUS DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE EVEN.

PARTY GIVES YOU FIRST AND LAST TIMELY WARNING AS USUAL. GIVE UP THE ABOVE POLICY INSTANTLY AND RELEASE ALL NEW ARRESTED PERSONS WITH RESPECT AND WITHOUT ANY CONDITION. ACT ACCORDINGLY WITHOUT DELAY OTHERWISE *YOU WILL BE NO WHERE IN NO TIME.*

BEWARE!

BEWARE!!

BEWARE!!!

'PRECAUTION IS BETTER THAN MEDICINE'

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

ACTING BAL RAJ II

GENERAL OF RAJASTHAN BRANCH

AS KNOWN TO LOCAL POLICE

'AMAR NATH'.

N.B.—Party hopes you to be wise and advises not to repeat the same mistake of not caring such warning like victim Deputy Superintendent of Police before you.

APPENDIX II

Extract from the Diary of Shri Sagarmal Gopa

- I. I refused to write a letter to Sjt. Achaleshwai Piasad Sharma in the way they liked—Red chillies were thrust into my rectum.
- II. When I refused to sign the apology in the original file chillies were thrust into my nose.
- III. *Birbal*—He beat me a crores of times in the solitary cell.
- IV. *Gumana Rawlot*—The man who is getting devilish atrocities committed on me is Gumana Rawlot. He is still after me. He gets me beaten by Hur prisoners, tortures me. I have sent complaints against him from Jail to Durbar.
- V. I was beaten many a time—an account of which is published in the paper dated 23rd May, 1945.
- VI. *Chullies in rectum*—Amir Khan Unad and Amad Kalav had thrust chillies in my rectum.
- VII. *2nd October, 1945*—Gumana Police Officer said this day that he would thrust chillies (in rectum) once again and get him (Gopa's) chopped off by Hur Prisoners. I have sent written information about this to the Court but no step has been taken.
- VIII. *Hur Burhan*—He is a Hur involved in murders. He is brother of Gumana by religious agreement. Gumana is getting me tortured through him. Resident should pay attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- A—*Official Records (MISS)*. Available in National Archives of India, New Delhi, and Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner.
- Foreign and Political Consultations and Proceedings.
- Foreign and Secret Consultations and Proceedings.
- Home Department.
- Rajputana Agency Records, Abu and Delhi.
- Records and Proceedings of Indian National Congress.
- B—*Reports and Gazetteers*
- Annual Administration Reports of Rajputana States: Jodhpur—1887-88, 1907-11, 1916-17, 1929-30, 1941-42. Bikaner—1916.
- Annual Report of Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Rajasthan, Malwa and Ajmer—1st March 1931—24th December 1931 and 1st January 1943 to 30th April, 1946.
- Arya Directory, published by International Arya League, Delhi.
- Bharatpur Rajpatra (1947).
- Bikaner State Gazette (1940).
- Chamber of Princes' Report, 1921.
- Constitutional Reforms Committee Report (Jaipur), 1943.
- Government of India Report (1875).
- Jaipur State Gazette (1940).
- Kota State Gazette (1941).
- Marwar State Gazette (1932, 1940, 1944).
- Mewar Agency Report, 1870-71, 1880-83.
- Paropakarini Sabha Report, 1883—1926 (Vedic Yantralaya, Ajmer).
- Sedition Committee Report, 1918.
- Sikar Enquiry Commission (written statement of Rao Raja Sikar).
- Erskine, K.D., A Gazetteer of the Udaipur State.
- Erskine, K.D., Rajputana Gazetteer, Vols. II-III.
- Imperial Gazetteer of India, Provincial Series, Rajputana.

C—Newspapers and Periodicals

(Available in Rajasthan State Archives, Bikaner and Saraswati Library, Fatchpur-Shekhawati).

Akhand Bharat (1936).

Amrit Bazar Patrika (1915).

Arjun (1932, 1934, 1936, 1940).

Bombay Chronicle (1914).

Harijan (1910, 1912).

Hindu (1910).

Hindustan (1910-1912, 1916).

Hindustan Times (1929, 1932, 1934, 1938-42, 1944-45).

Indian Daily Mail (1927).

Karam Bhumi (1910).

Light (1932).

Lok Manyu (1936, 1916).

Marwari (1909).

Mewar Praja Mandal (Bulletin), 1938-47.

Miran (1958).

Modern Review (1915).

National Call (1910, 1912).

National Herald (1928-39).

Nav Jeevan (1910-41, 1915-47).

Nav Jyoti (1916).

Navyug Sandesh (1952).

New India (1915).

Pragati (1912).

Praja Sewak (1911-42, 1916).

Princely India (1926, 1931-32).

Rajasthan (1935-36).

Rajasthan Patrika (1885).

Rajasthan Sandesh (1931).

Rajasthan Times (1895).

Riyasat (1927-29).

Riyasati Duniya (1932).

Sainik (1940).

Statesman (1933).

Swarashtra (1932).

Tarun Rajasthan (1924).

Times of India (1875, 1929).

Tribune (1929, 1934).

Tyag Bhumi (1931).

Vir Arjun (1940-42, 1946).

Vishwa Mitra (1941, 1946).

Young Rajasthan (1929).

D.—*Published Literature (English)*

Adams, Archibald. *Western Rajputana States* (1899).

Aitchison. *Treaties, Engagements and Sanads*, Vol. III.

Baylay. *History of Gujarat* (London, 1886).

Besant, Annie. *India, A Nation*.

Beveridge. *Baburnama*, Vol. II.

Bikaner and the War (A Bikaner Government Publication, 1942, 1944).

Cambridge History of India, Vols. III-IV.

Chamupati, N.A. *Glimpses of Dayanand*.

Chaturvedi, A.S. *Struggle for Responsible Government in Bharatpur State* (1947).

Chirol, Valentine. *Indian Unrest* (1910).

Chudgar, P.L. *The Indian Princes under British Protection* (1929).

Deepak, Jagdish Chandra. *Revenged in London* (1958).

Elliot, H.H. *History of India*, Vol. VII (1880).

Enthovern. *Tribes and Castes of Bombay*, Vol. I.

Ersikine, K.D. *The Western Rajputant State and the Bikaner Agency*.

Fraser, J. Ballic. *The Military Memoirs of Lt.-Col. James Skinner*, Vol. II.

Forrest, G.W. *History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. III (1912).

George, MacMunn. *The Indian States and the Princes*.

Graham. *The Bhil Tribes of Khandesh*.

Heimsath, Charles, C. *Nationalism and Hindu Social Reforms*.

Indian Contributions in the War, Vol. I (N.K. Press, Lucknow).

Jwala Sahai. *Loyal Rajputana* (1902).

Kaye, J.W. *Life and Correspondence of Lord Charles Metcalfe*, Vol. I (1854).

Kaye, J.W. *A History of the Sepoy War in India*, Vol. I (1870).

Kaye and Malleeson. *History of Indian Mutiny*, Vol. V (1888).

Khafi Khan, Muhammed Hashim. *Muntakhab-ul-Lubab*.

Kishan Puri. *Memoirs of Marwar Police*.

Lekhram, P. *Life of Maharshi Dayanand* (Urdu).

Malcolm. *Political History of India*.

- Marshman, J.C. *History of India*.
- Mead, Henry. *The Sepoy Revolt, 1857*.
- Mehta, M.S. *Lord Hastings and Indian States* (Bombay, 1930).
- Melleson. *History of the Indian Mutiny*, Vols. II-IV.
- Menon, V.P. *The Integration of Indian States* (1956).
- Mukhopadhyaya, D.N. *Life of Dayanand Saraswati*, Part II (V.S. 1990, translation), ed. by Pt. Ghasi Ram.
- Naik, T.B. *The Bhils, a Study*.
- Narrative of the State of Bikaner (1933).
- Pannikar, K.M. *British Policy Towards Indian States*.
- Prichard. *The Mutinies in Rajputana* (London, 1860).
- Raulinson. *The British Government in India*.
- Reid, Stanley. *Indian Year Book, 1915*.
- Roberts, P. *British India*.
- Ross. *Correspondence of Cornwallis*, Vol. III (1859).
- Sarda, H.B. *Maharana Kumbha* (1932).
- Sarda, H.B. *Ajmer, Historical and Descriptive*.
- Sarda, H.B. *Life of Dayanand Saraswati* (1946).
- Sardesai, G.S. *New History of Marathas*, Vol. III (1948).
- Sarkar, J.N. *History of Aurangzeb*, Vol. III (1921).
- Sarkar, J.N. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, Vol. I.
- Sen, S.N. *Eighteen Fifty-seven* (1957).
- Sharma, G.N. *Mewar and the Mughal Emperors* (1954).
- Showers, C.L. *A Missing Chapter of Indian Mutiny* (1888).
- Singh, G.N. *Indian States and British India—their future relations* (1930).
- Sittarmayya, P. *The History of Congress*, Vol. I.
- Somerset, Playns. *Indian States*.
- Stratchey, William. *India and Its Administration*.
- Thornton. *Gazetteer of Territories under the East India Company*, Vol. II (1854).
- Tod, James. *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*. Vols. I-II.
- Vaidya, Kanhiyalal D. *Progressive Jodhpur under British Prime Minister Sir Donald Field* (1912) (Abu-Collection, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur).
- Vanwart. *Life of General Sir Pratap Singh*.
- Wellesley Despatches, Vol. III.
- Webb. *Currencies of the Hindu States of Rajputana*.
- Wheeler. Stephen. *Delhi Coronation Darbar* (Abu Collection, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur).

Yajnik, Indu Lal. *Shyamaji Krishna Varma, Life and Times of an Indian Revolutionery* (1950).

E—*Published Literature* (Hindi and Dingal)

Bajaj, Ram Krishna. *Patra Vyavahar* (Sasta Sahitya Mandal, New Delhi).

Chowdhry, Ram Narain. *Vartman Rajasthan* (1918).

Dayanand Saraswati. *Swikar Patra* (a pamphlet).

Dayanand Saraswati. *Satyartha Prakash* (1925).

Deepak, Jagdish Chandra. *Jab Janta Jagi Thi*.

Gehlot, J.S. *Rajputana Ka Itihas*, Vols. I-III.

Har Prasad. *Azadi Ke Dewane* (Pratap Prakashan, Bewar).

Jain, Ajit Prasad. *Agyat Jeevan* (1951).

Jaisalmer Ka Jan Andolan (District Congress Committee, Jaisalmer).

Kaviraja Shyamaldas. *Vir Vinod*, Vol. I-IV.

Kela, Bhagwan Das. *Deshi Rajya Shasan*.

Kela, Bhagwan Das. *Deshi Rajyon Ki Jan Jagriti* (1948).

Mehta, Prithvi Singh. *Hamare Rajasthan*, Prayag (1950).

Narayan Abhinandan Grantha (Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Delhi, 1945).

Ojha, G.H. *Udaipur Rajya Ka Itihas*.

Ojha, G.H. *Rajputana Ka Itihas*, Vols. I-III.

Pathik's statement before the Mewar Court (1926).

Raghubir Singh. *Purva Adhunik Rajasthan*, Udaipur (1951).

Rajasthan—Bhilon Ke Lok Geet (Sahitya Sansthan Udaipur).

Sahiwal. *Arjun Singh Ka Jeevan Charitra*.

Sanyal, Sachindra Nath. *Bandi Jeevan*, 2 parts (1922).

Saxena, S.S. *Pathik Jeevani* (1963).

Sharma, M.L. *Kota Rajya Ka Itihas*, Vols. I-II (V.S. 1996).

Surajmal. *Vamsha Bhaskar*, Part IV.

Vachaspati, Indra Vidya. *Arya Samaj Ka Itihas*, Part I.

Vyas Jainarain. *Marwar Men Uttardayi Shasan* (Published by Marwar Lok Parishad, Jodhpur).

Vyas, Jainarain. *Bikaner Shadyantra case—kuchh Gyattava Baten*.

Upadhyaya and Joshi. *Rajasthan Ke Jyoti Stambha* (1949).

INDEX

A

Abby Singh, 21
 Abod Behari, 130
 Afghan War (1878-79), 105
 Ahmed Baksh Khan, 27
 Ajit Singh (Thakur), 61
 Allauddin, 2
 Amir Khan (Nawab), 41
 Amir Chand (Lala), 130, 131
 Amrit Bazar Patrika, 125, 132
 Anti-Seditious Act, 269
 Arbindo Ghosh, 131
 Arjan Lal Sethi, 78, 128, 129, 130,
 131, 132, 134, 135, 139, 147,
 148, 161, 203, 269, 271
 Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, 110
 Arya Samaj, 108, 110, 114, 125
 Aurangzeb, 3

B

Babur, 2
 Bal Gangadhar Tilak, 153, 154
 Bande Matram, 123, 153
 Benares Conspiracy Case, 140
 Besant (Miss A.), 112
 Bengu Agitation, 155
 Bhadur Singh (Thakur), 21
 Bhai Parma Nand, 258
 Bharat Singh (Thakur), 21
 Bharatpur Praja Madal, 202
 Bhil Movement, 162
 Bhopal Singh (Thakur), 111
 Bijolia Movement, 150, 211
 Bikaner Conspiracy Case, 203
 Bikaner Praja Parishad, 242
 Bikaner Press Act, 244
 Burkat Ali, 31

C

Cabinet Mission, 236, 267

Canning (Lord), 79, 80
 Chamber of Pines, 145
 Champ Lal (Nager Seth), 86, 89
 Chand Singh (Thakur), 61
 Chandawal Tragedy, 260
 Chander Sen, 3
 Charles Metcalf (Sir), 11, 13, 15,
 30, 35, 36, 37, 39
 Civil Disobedience Movement,
 199, 202, 208, 217, 219, 235
 Cornwallis (Lord), 9
 Cripps Mission, 267
 Curzon (Lord), 122

D

Dabra Agitation, 265
 Dadabhai Naroji, 116
 Dalhousie (Lord), 45
 Damodardas Rathi, 120, 127
 Dandi March, 219
 Delhi Durbar (1903), 121
 Dhonkal Singh, 34
 Dogra Shooting Case, 223
 Duke of Connaught, 146
 Dungan Singh alias Doongji, 45,
 90
 Durjansal, 28, 29, 30, 47
 Dwarka Prasad Kaushik, 243
 Dyer (General), 147

E

East India Company, 1, 48, 79

F

Faiz Ali (Nawab), 101, 102
 Fateh Raj, 31
 Fateh Ram (Vakil), 7
 First World War, 143, 146, 270

G

Gandhi-Irwin Pact, 220
 Ganesh Narayan, 14, 24
 Gauri Shanker (Pt.), 148
 George Barlow, 9, 10
 Gokal Chand Mehta (Pradhan), 53
 Govind Das Seth, 150
 Govind Mahadeo Ranade, 110
 Govind Singh (Raja), 109
 Gaulab Singh, 72

H

Harding Bomb Case, 130, 133
 Hari Bhai Kinkar, 147
 Hari Bhau Upadhyaya, 213, 215, 217, 235, 262, 271
 Hastings (Lord), 11, 13, 17
 Hira Lal Shastri, 262
 Hume, A.O., 116, 117

I

Ibrahim Lodhi, 2
 Indian National Congress, 114, 117, 118, 123, 132, 149, 239
 Indian States Act (1922), 146
 Indra Singh Azad, 192

J

Jagat Singh (Thakur), 61
 Jai Dayal (Vakil), 67
 Jai Hind, 243
 Jai Narain Vyas, 256, 261, 264, 265
 Jaipur Praja Madal, 198, 236
 Jalianwala Bagh, 231, 270
 Jalim Singh (Thakur), 61
 Jamna Lal Bajaj, 148, 195, 215, 271, 272
 Jat Mahasabha Agitation, 201
 Jawahar Day, 253
 Jawaharlal Nehru, 195, 215, 226, 244, 247, 253, 256, 262, 266
 Jawala Prashad, 220, 221, 223, 225, 226, 230, 233, 234, 272
 Jugal Kishore Chaturvedi, 160, 161, 247, 272

K

Kal Kesri, 125
 Kanhiya Lal Kalyantri, 147
 Karam Yogin, 125
 Kesri Singh Barhat, 139, 148, 151, 269
 King Edward VII, 126
 Krishna Kumari, 10
 Kunj Behari Lal, 250
 Kushal Singh (Thakur), 59, 61, 77

L

Lahore Garda Bomb Case, 133
 Lake (General), 6, 7, 9
 Lawrence (General), 49, 58, 60, 109

M

Madan Lal Dhingra, 149
 Madan Mohan Malviya, 153
 Madho Singh, 29
 Mahatma Gandhi, 147, 150, 160, 180, 214, 219, 226, 229, 232, 247, 258, 266, 270, 271
 Maharaja Balwant Singh, 30
 Maharaja Bakht Singh, 33
 Maharaja Baldeo Singh, 28
 Maharaja Bhim Singh, 6, 16, 38
 Maharaja Jai Singh, 41, 126
 Maharaja Jagat Singh, 8, 13, 21, 22
 Maharaja Jaswant Singh, 34, 96, 97, 109, 110
 Maharaja Kalyan Singh, 41
 Maharaja Madan Pal, 74
 Maharaja Man Singh, 6, 8, 14, 15, 31, 32, 34, 41, 43, 44, 46
 Maharaja Nar Singh Pal, 45
 Maharaja Rana Bhagwat Singh, 73
 Maharaja Surat Singh, 15
 Maharao Ram Singh, 41
 Maharana Fateh Singh, 89, 90, 121, 151
 Maharana Gaj Singh, 90
 Maharana Partap, 2
 Maharana Sajjan Singh, 89, 106, 108, 109, 118

Maharana Shambu Singh, 89
 Maharaja Takht Singh, 95
 Maharaja Sardar Singh, 93
 Maharao Kishore Singh, 24, 25
 Maharao Umed Singh, 24
 Maulana Shaukat Ali, 148
 Mayo (Lord), 88, 102
 Mayo College Bomb Case, 222
 Megh Singh (Thakur), 24
 Menon, V. P., 266
 Meo Agitation, 189
 Mewar Praja Mandal, 216, 218, 239
 Minto (Lord), 9, 10, 123
 Mohan Lal Sukhadia, 240
 Mont-Ford Report, 145, 147
 Moti Lal Nehru, 148
 Motilal Tejawat, 178, 179, 180, 240, 270
 Mutiny, 48, 51, 76, 77, 269

N

Nand Kishore (Vakil), 64
 Native Coinage Act, 94
 Neemuchana Tragedy, 188
 Nimej Murder Case, 128, 130

O

Ojha, Kashinath, 15

P

Partition of Bengal, 123
 Pattabhi Sitaramaya, 113
 Pratap Singh Barhat, 139, 140
 Press Act, 270
 Prithvi Singh (Thakur), 35
 Prince of Wales, 102

Q

Queen's proclamation, 79
 Queen Victoria, 79, 81, 98, 104, 105, 106
 Quit India, 112, 184, 234, 239, 272

R

Raisingh Nagar Tragedy, 245
 Rai Chand Singh, 13

Rajasthan Kesri, 147
 Rajasthan Patrika, 118
 Rajasthan Times, 118
 Ram Singh (Thakur), 92,
 Ram Narain Chowdry, 140, 141, 142, 147, 149, 154, 161 219
 Rana Raj Singh, 4
 Rana Ratan Singh, 2
 Rana Sangha, 2
 Rana Shambhu Singh, 83
 Ranjit Singh (Thakur), 109
 Rao Bawal, 56
 Rao Gopal Singh, 78, 136, 137, 138, 139, 148, 269
 Rao Raja Bakhtawar Singh, 26
 Rao Raja Laxman Singh, 21
 Rao Maldeo, 3
 Rao Ram Chandra, 74
 Rao Shiv Singh, 41
 Rash Behari Bose, 131, 137
 Rashtrdoot, 125
 Rana Shanbm Singh, 83
 Rawal Sheo Singh, 70, 71
 Ripon (Lord), 109
 Rowlatt Act, 270

S

Sachindar Nath Sanyal, 139
 Saddollah Khan, 71
 Samand Singh (Thakur), 61
 Sarkar, J.N., 3
 Satyagraha Movement, 261
 Sawai Jai Singh, 22
 Sawai Singh, 6
 Second World War, 192, 228, 242, 272
 Shah Alam, 98
 Shamboo Ratna Pathshala, 85
 Shah Shiv Lal, 19
 Sheodan Singh, 72
 Sheonath Singh (Thakur), 61
 Shobha Lal Gupta, 149, 215
 Shyamaji Krishna Varma, 119, 120
 Simla Conference, 267
 Sukhdeo Prasad, (Sir), 98, 207, 215
 Swami Nar Singh, 150
 Swami Dayanand, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 117, 120
 'Swarajya', 112, 129, 134
 Syed Ahmed Khan (Sir), 116

T

Tantia Tope, 68, 69

Trevelyan, 44

Tod (Col.), 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24,
25, 32

U

Union Jack, 230

Usman Khan (Miyan), 71

V

Vallabh Bhai Patel, 266

Varanasi Seva Singh, 185

Vidya Pracharni Sabha, 152

Vijay Singh Pathik, 78, 136, 138,
147, 148, 150, 151, 155, 180,
212

Vir Durgadas 34

W

Walayat Ali Khan (Nawab), 71

Wellesley (Lord), 4, 6, 8

Wazir Khan (Nawab), 74.

William Bentinck (Lord), 39, 40
41

Z

Zalim Singh 16, 24, 25, 154